

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF  
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.  
OCTOBER, 1887.

---

ARTICLE I.

THE TRINITY.\*

By S. A. ORT, D. D., President of Wittenberg College and Professor of Theology, Springfield, O.

The present lecture is the beginning of the second series on the Holman foundation. In accordance with the example set by my distinguished predecessor, Rev. J. A. Brown, D. D., to whom was assigned the special honor of delivering the first lecture in the Holman course on the Augsburg Confession, I have chosen, now that the first series has been completed, the same subject with which he introduced this Lectureship to the Lutheran public, namely the first article of the Confession, that which treats of the Godhead.

It was surely a wise and liberal act of Dr. Holman to provide, as he has done, for the careful treatment annually of a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. No kind of discussion can be more profitable than that which searches for the wide and deep meaning of the truth in Christianity. He who, consequently, makes possible by the endowment of a lectureship the examination of the formulated teaching of the sacred Scrip-

---

\*First Lecture of the Second Series of the Holman course on the AUGSBURG CONFESION, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 27, 1887.

ture, may indeed be styled a benefactor to his generation, and a true lover of the Church of Jesus Christ. A valuable feature of this endowment is its perpetuity. An exposition and a defence of the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion are thereby secured not only for the ministry and laity of the present period in our Church, but also for those of succeeding times. In this fact appears real utility of the lectureship. While the truth contained in the divine word is unchangeable and identical for all times, still its apprehension by the human mind may be clearer and deeper in one age than another. Besides, each generation must determine for itself what is the sense in which it shall accept the doctrines of the Gospel. No man can apprehend truth for his fellowman; the Church in one period cannot believe for the Church in a period following. Each must receive the teachings of the Scriptures on its own account and formulate its understanding of their real meaning.

It is true one can help the other, and lead it even to a fuller apprehension of the pure word, and in this way the expositions and apologies of Christian doctrine in the past become towers of strength in the future, nevertheless, each generation of Christendom must examine and apprehend the Confession of the Church for itself in order that it may be able to say intelligently, This is my creed. Moreover, the Christian Church in her progress through the world is troubled and assailed by heresy and doubt. These opponents of the true doctrine are in nature always the same, but in form variable. At one time they wear the phase of philosophic speculation; at another they vaunt the pretensions of science falsely so called. Now it is Deism, then Pantheism, now Ebionitism, then Doketism, now Naturalism, then Rationalism. Successful resistance demands the apology of the Church to be always according to the mode of the onset. It is, hence, needful that every age make its own defence, and that this be done in the way necessitated by the kind of weapon which the enemy employs. Repeated and continuous discussion of the prime doctrines of the divine Word is, therefore, essential, in order that the Church may have in each period of her history a clear consciousness of what she believes, and be able to witness to every creature on earth, This is the truth.

The establishment of a theological lectureship, in consequence, may be truly affirmed a helpful method for a defence of the Christian faith, and the maintenance of sound doctrine. In the spirit of such design I undertake in this presence a treatment of what is involved in the first article of our Confession. The text is as follows: "The churches with common consent among us do teach that the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning the unity of the divine essence and of the three persons is true and without doubt to be believed: to wit, that there is one divine essence, which is called and is God, eternal, without body, indivisible, of infinite power, wisdom, goodness, the Creator and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible: and that yet there be three persons of the same essence and power, who also are co-eternal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The contents of this article are, first, the being of God; second, the mode of his being.

#### I. THE BEING OF GOD.

A few subjects have absorbed human thought. Chief among these is the divine existence. Away back in the ages men tried to solve the problem of what is beyond the region of the seen. They sought God, if haply they might find him; but their best effort could not clear away uncertainty. The deepest thinking gave only an abstract conception of being, which was thoroughly unintelligible. In modern times the endeavors to determine the question of the supernatural have been no less earnest and intense. Philosophy and science alike busy themselves in working out a final solution. They use the deepest mental processes and make the most careful experiment, but neither the logic of the one, nor the crucible of the other, has revealed what the human mind is most anxious to know. The latest teaching is that the Theistic question cannot be solved, it is an indeterminate problem. The Being of God is unknowable. This is not a recent discovery or a new invention. It is simply the revival of Phystonism, or what at another time was known as Humism. In consciousness is given the perception of phenomena: but since nothing is known by the intellect which was not previously in the sense, it is the phenomenal alone that is

matter of knowledge. But the phenomenal is the temporary, the changeable. All that is known, hence, is the fleeting. There is no certain knowledge of entire mental or material being, because sensations only are perceived in consciousness. Real existence of both matter and mind must, therefore, be a subject of doubt, likewise that of a divine being. This type of philosophical thought neither affirms nor denies. It simply doubts.

Another form of philosophy disposes of the theistic problem in this wise: All knowledge is positive. Positive knowledge is gained by thinking. Whatever is thinkable is knowable. The unthinkable, hence, is the unknowable. But the materials for thinking are perceptions in the sense, the result must be a knowing of phenomena in their limitations and relations. Man knows the relations of things; the things themselves are unknown. The former only have significance, reality, the latter are meaningless and fit merely for empty speculation. Abstraction and generalization give higher forms of being. The ultimate reach is empty consciousness. This persists in the absence of every phenomenon. What then underlies its continuance? Evidently a persistent absolute force. Here is something, "deeper than demonstration, deeper than definite cognition; deep as the very nature of mind, the persistence of Force." All that is known of this absolute Force is that it Persists. Sheer existence of an eternal reality is emphatically affirmed. Beyond this it is impossible to say aught. Spencerian agnosticism believes an impersonal energy always to be, but this absolute is outside the realm of the distinguishable and the relative, and, if ever known, must be known as persistence in consciousness. But persistence in consciousness can give only the limited. The knowable, therefore, is the finite.

In like manner the Kantian philosophy declares, "All our knowledge of existence belongs entirely to the sphere of experience; and although an existence out of this sphere cannot be absolutely affirmed to be impossible, it is a hypothesis, the truth of which we have no means of ascertaining." This conclusion is reached by a critical examination of our knowing powers. What can we know? is the inquiry raised. A careful analysis

gives the following reply: Knowledge embraces phenomena and their relations. Phenomena are the perceptions of sensations, given either externally or internally. Their relations are the modes according to which they appear in consciousness. These relations are conditional for experience, and constitute the laws for knowing. For instance, space and time are necessary for the reception of surface and a train of events. The principle of cause is essential for the real connection of antecedent and consequent. These are *a priori* truths. They make experience possible, and determine how it must be. Speculative reason cognizes the principles and furnishes them to the understanding for the purpose of conducting the operation of connection. But space and time are purely subjective, and since sensations are only ways in which objects affect our senses, what is perceived in consciousness is not the thing itself, but merely impressions under these subjective forms.

The object itself is never known by sense intuition, as perceived in consciousness it is phenomenon. The thing in itself is thought and never given through sensation. Against Locke "the German philosopher sought to prove that we have ideas independent of experience, and, against Hume, that these ideas have a necessary and universal character." These ideas are forms of perceptions and judgment and not modes of real existence. They are purely subjective. For the reason that they exist in the mind, they cannot exist out of it. They are simply necessary conditions for mental action. They determine the possibility of knowing by the human mind, and, if this possibility is ever realized, so must the perceiving and thinking be.

An external world is assumed to exist, on the ground that it is logically necessary, but any knowledge of its reality is impossible. Speculative reason is merely a regulative faculty, directing the understanding to a certain aim. It works in the region of the transcendental, that is beyond experience, the world of ideas, which regulates our thinking, but contains no real objects. Speculative reason knows nothing of the real, its sphere is entirely the ideal. Beyond the transcendental is the transcendent. This is the realm of the Absolute. Into this region it is impossible for the speculative reason to go. True, it

has a conception of a Supreme being, as a mental necessity, but aside from a divine ideal, altogether faultless, it has no cognition. But since pure reason is the faculty for logical certainty, it is manifest that the demonstration of the real existence of both the universe and God cannot be made. This philosophy cognizes the necessity for the idea of the supernatural, but knows nothing of him as the *ens realissimum*.

The meaning is, that without this conception the mind would be turned adrift, and consistent, systematic thinking would not be possible. The idea of a Supreme being is a mere hypothesis rendered necessary by the existence of the world, and for the purpose of referring "all phenomena to an all embracing being as the supreme and all sufficient cause." In the several theories mentioned, nothing concerning a divine existence is determined. By some the whole question relating to a supernatural [being] is indifferently dismissed as a subject of no concern to the human mind and advantage in human life. It is treated as a superstitious notion which has arisen out of a fetish state, and with the progress of culture will be gradually eliminated from the history of man. Finally it will be a thing of the ruder past and men in their possession of high intellectual attainments, will no longer exercise their mental powers in trying to know whether an eternal something existed before star dust and protoplasm, or who it is that dwells beyond the sky. By others the problem of a divine existence is treated more seriously. In fact the positive affirmation is, that an Absolute exists. To this, the mind in its logical regressus from present fact to ultimate cause, is rigidly forced. Additional to this, it is impossible to offer a single statement. Being is, but to it can be ascribed no perfection. Attribute and essence are completely separated. The supernatural, hence, is everlastingly unknowable. Practically, then, he does not exist. The Absolute is a mere conception of abstract thought for whose real existence there can be no verification. In like manner the critical philosophy denies the reality of a divine being to be a question which the logical understanding can ever answer. It is an enigma, a puzzle whose secret speculative reason, the faculty for science and philosophy, is incompetent to find out.

The problem must, therefore, be handed over to the practical reason, the faculty which cognizes freedom. This is the region of reality. Here the transcendent is known. Freedom gives the conviction of moral obligation, what I ought to be. In setting before me what I ought to be, there is at the same time afforded the assurance of what I may hope. But since what I ought to be carries with it the possibility of what I may become, the realization of this demands that my existence be continued without end. Hence I know myself to be immortal. Further what I may become, for the practical reason, can be no empty form, but is already realized. Otherwise the highest good would be a delusion. But the highest good for me is only possible, when it is realized in a being higher than myself. The actualization of the highest good, therefore, postulates the existence of God. This is the famous moral argument for the being of the Supernatural.

Aside from the deduction of the practical reason, the result thus far reached is negative. Two positive views concerning the being of God have on the other hand been advanced and defended by the majority of thinkers. The first is the pantheistic conception of God.

Pantheism has two forms, idealistic and materialistic. The former teaches that mind is the Absolute and the universe its phenomenon; the latter that force is the only reality, and is deity. The first is called Acosmism; the second Pancosmism. In short God is everything, or everything is God. Strictly speaking these two forms at last merge into one, absolute substance or pure being. Modern philosophy began with a distinct recognition of two realities, mind and matter. Each was affirmed to be a substance. The definition, however, given of substance, namely, that which is self-existent, marked out the road that the new attempt of human thought must take and determined its destination. Spinoza quickly saw the necessary consequences. Real existence of two eternal realities is absurd. One only can be. This is the Absolute. It is not matter, for what reason should it be more than mind. It is not mind, why should it be more than matter. In truth then it is neither. Since there can be no more than one substance and this is the Absolute, neither

matter nor mind has substantial being. What then are they ? Eternal attributes.

But as attributes they express nothing of substance. They are not its manifestation in any form. Substance is neither understanding nor extension. Matter and mind, hence, are mere external attachments. They are ways the understanding has of perceiving the essence of substance. In reality they are nothing, and can mean nothing.

In the absolute of Spinoza everything finite is lost. It is the fathomless abyss which swallows up the entire universe of seeming actual existence. If now we turn to ask what is this absolute no answer is returned other than it is that which self-exists. Further reply is impossible, because *omnis determinatio est negatio*, every determination is a negation, that is every attempted definition denies to being that which it really is.

The God of Spinoza has neither reason nor will ; he is existence, or, to adopt the eleatic statement, is pure being. He appears in consciousness, now as thought, then as extension, but these are only modes of his manifestation and show nothing of what he is in himself. He is neither mind nor matter in any sense, but the infinite, infinite nothing.

The great problem in philosophy has been and still is to adjust the relation between the two factors in knowledge, subject and object. Spinoza annihilates the reality of both, the result is nameless existence, a measureless ocean whose surface presents now the scene of waters rolling in waves of varied height, then surging in wild madness, heaving and tossing in restless fury far and wide, again calm, smooth, with not the smallest ripple, a boundless waste. "All particular existences, all that seems individual being, are only bubbles that fret, or vapors that rise from this ever heaving and shoreless sea ; and they will soon break, or be collected in drops, and find their way back to identity with that which is at once their birth-place and their tomb." This is deity, destitute of consciousness, intelligence and will, the ocean of pure being.

In the Kantian philosophy, the reality of the subject was emphasized, and that of the object assumed. Fichte on the contrary rejected the valid existence of the noumenon, the thing in

itself, and maintained that in the proposition, "I think" certainly refers only to the subject.

Knowledge is composed of two elements, the thinker and the act of the thinker. Both are together in consciousness. They express, hence, the relative. In short the ego acting is knowledge. But the ego in consciousness cannot be the ego out of consciousness, although it necessarily presupposes it, because the one is known while the other is not known. In the present case the search is not for an ultimate philosophy, but a final science. An exhaustive science, however, demands for its basis a self-evident, necessary truth. This is at once found in the proposition  $A = A$ . From this is readily drawn the opposite,  $A$  is not: not  $A$ . The equation  $A = A$  affirms nothing concerning existence. It declares merely the principle of equality. In matter it is purely hypothetical. If now there be any reality this can be substituted for the symbol. This evidently is at hand and must be the knower of the formula just stated. We may, hence, legitimately substitute ego for  $A$  and say  $\text{ego} = \text{ego}$ . But the opposite of ego is non-ego. The antithesis consequently is, ego is not: not ego. Nevertheless in consciousness ego and non ego do not stand apart from or over against each other. They are together in unity. This unity is knowledge. Non-ego is the action of the ego. If the latter were not, the former could not be. But the effect carries with it necessarily into consciousness the cause. Since, therefore, knowledge embraces only ego and non-ego, and since the second is produced by the first, it follows for one thing that subject and object reciprocally limit one another, and again that the only real existence is not the ego in consciousness, but the ego out of consciousness. This only is the universal, the absolute, the unconditioned.

I am not authorized, however, to say "it is my ego or your ego or any ego in particular; for as yet there is no distinction between me and you, but whoever points the ego is that ego and is alone in the universe. This is absolute idealism or rather egoism and pantheism both in one." According to this view God is infinite activity.

Again, as the philosopher I sit down and fix attention solely on the ego and non-ego in consciousness. I abstract one mark of difference and then another, until finally I see them without distinction. Subject and object both have vanished from my intellectual vision, and I gaze on what is neither one nor the other, but the identity of the two. The ego has disappeared and likewise the non-ego. There remains only pure identity, and this is the absolute. The process may be represented on this wise. Take matter, abstract one quality and then another, until the process has been exhausted. The result is pure being. Treat mind in the same manner. The outcome is as before. But pure being must be identical with pure being; that is the point at which matter and mind become the same is the absolute. According to this view God is infinite Potence. One philosopher assumes the real existence of the subjective and calls this God, another sees both subject and object at their indifference point and names this Deity; a third follows objecting to each position taken, and rejects them as alike unphilosophical. There is left still another course that may be taken. The fundamental reality in egoism and absolute identity is neither the ego on the one hand nor the identity on the other, but the process involved in both. This is thought. We can dismiss the content in either case, and attend simply to the process. "The outward thing is nothing, the inward perception is nothing, for neither could exist alone; the only reality is the relation of the two, which shows that the essence or nature of being itself consists in the co-existence of two opposites."

This co-existence can be found only in consciousness. It is not possible that it should be elsewhere. Subject and object are known entirely in relation. Destroy the connection between them and both instantly cease to be. It is, therefore, the basis of their existence, and constitutes what is called the thing itself. Co-existence of subject and object is idea, and is the only reality known. Thought is relation, and is identical with being. The highest mental abstraction is universal being. But that which is void of all quality is indeterminate. Between it and nothing there is no distinction. Pure being or thought is therefore equal to naught. No more is known of the one in itself than the

other. Pure being in itself is nothing, and not being in itself the same. But these, being and not being in relation are something, they are existence. The absolute, hence, is not pure being, but the union of being and non being. He is the everlasting becoming, the eternal process of thinking. He generates being and non being by thinking them in co-existence; he is then co-existence. He is, therefore, the ONE, because he is relation; he is the ALL, because the all is only relations. To find this absolute it is merely necessary to begin with any notion in consciousness, and trace the way backward by the dialectic method. The final abstraction is the one. For every fact in consciousness there is the absolute. If the idea seized be that of personal existence then the discovery will be personality, not, God who is a person, but personality itself, which can only have reality in the consciousness which thinks it.

Consequently apart from the universal consciousness of man, there is no divine consciousness or personality. According to this view God exists as thought ever realizing itself, but never realized. He is the eternal movement of the universal. It can be readily observed that this final philosophy of the absolute ends in the boldest pantheism. Kant boldly maintained the position that a science of God is impossible. His successors in the field of philosophic thought, however, determined to show that the sage of Koenigsberg was mistaken. They began with experience in consciousness, and resolved the dualism of subject and object, one by suppressing the real existence of the object, and deifying the subject; a second by recognizing the reality of both, but as eternal processions from their identity, a third by affirming their actual existence as relation, and in this by a process of resistless logic finding the source of all things. The conclusion was as thoroughly in consciousness as the beginning. The circle was completed; the terminal the same as the starting point. The final result like the first, pantheism. This was precisely what the author of the "Critique" insisted must ever be the outcome of regulative thought, a God in idea. No wonder that after these journeyings of the human mind over the wide continent of knowledge, descending into the deep valleys, climbing the hills and scaling the mountain heights of

thought, there should now be an anxious return to the country whence departure was taken, to examine more closely its scope and bearing, if perchance a better route to the longed-for destination cannot be traced. What road other than some of the ways already taken is apparent? It may be said, with sound reason, that a different course from Kantian ground is impossible. Logical thought is circumscribed by the limits of space and time. Beyond these it never can go. Reason may furnish the idea of an absolute, a supernatural, to the dialectic faculty, and in the processes of this faculty this idea may be used necessarily, but it must at the same time be observed, that the logical method determines nothing concerning reality. Logic decides the correctness of the form of judgments, but is indifferent about their matter. It uses the idea of a supernatural in its operations of connection, without raising the slightest inquiry concerning actual existence. Its province is not to find out what is real but to furnish a science of the laws of thought. The question, hence, is, Can reason vouch for the reality, corresponding to its ideas? It possesses the conception of an absolute, does it know this absolute to be real? Does it have the idea of a God because he exists, or is it an idea whose necessity is demanded by the process of logic? At this point pure theism begins. Necessary idea involves necessary existence. The possession of the first is conviction that the second exists.

The existence is in the idea. The old saying is that something has always been. The contradictory is inconceivable, hence impossible. The Absolute, the Infinite necessarily exists. Here pantheist and theist agree. So far the conception is the pure abstract. It is simple Absoluteness, bold Infinity. But when the inquiry is raised, What is this always something, this necessary abstraction, pantheist and theist part company. Both are bound by necessity, need an Absolute. Both begin their reply by positing a self-evident proposition, gotten in the same way by each, namely, intuition. The one sees an infinite activity, an absolute Potence, an eternal process; the other an absolute Reason, who is intelligence and will. If now the question be asked, Why the latter rather than the former? the answer is, because reason is so constituted that it would be unreason if it

did not have this idea. In its making this was wrought into its very being in such way that the two are altogether inseparable. Human reason is the image of the absolute reason. When, therefore, it knows itself, it thereby necessarily cognizes the existence of the divine being. In other words, in apprehending what it is in itself, it finds the necessary idea of a God. But this necessary idea is the fundamental principle of finite reason, hence, according to the essential law that every effect must have a cause, logic demonstrates the necessary existence of the eternal God, that is dialectics reveals, makes certain, what the human mind holds in its very being.

The existence of finite reason is ground for the conviction of certainty, concerning the actual being of the absolute reason. It can readily be perceived that the swing is now made from the *a priori* method for the determination of the divine existence, to the *a posteriori* form for logical proof. The true starting point is a known reality. This may be either the universe external to man, or man himself. By induction of natural facts, and observation of their connections a stairway is constructed up from one grade of existence to another until the loftiest height of nature has been reached, and then the human mind standing on this high eminence gathers up the highest power of its being and leaps unerringly into the very bosom of its source, the eternal, personal God. Pure theism conceives the Absolute to be the unconditioned, the self-intelligent, the self-sufficient. He is distinct from and independent of the universe, and the creator of all things. Deism, however, goes no further. God has originated the universe, and ordained its laws. Beyond this he has no connection with the world of finite being. The works of his hand were made in perfectness. They have no need of his care. They were created to stand and move alone and attain their destiny. He has no want they could supply. They have no need which requires his aid. From the nature of the case, providential government is absurd. The almighty God once came forth from the solitude of his eternity and created the worlds, then retired into the solitariness of his being, and, without the smallest concern, left the universe with all its divers forms of life to run its career of fate. He constructed a most

wonderful machine, set it going, and then withdrew to be the idle spectator of its varied movements. This conception of the Supreme Being undeifies him, and makes nature to be an independent reality.

It is in place now to observe that the two systems, pantheism, and natural theism, fail to solve the problem of God and the universe. This is true as respects the actual existence of both and their relation to each other. Pantheism finds an Absolute, but he is the Absolute of space and time. It knows a universe, but it is the Absolute ever unfolding himself. It puts them in necessary relation to one another, but such is the relation that they are inseparable. Natural theism on the contrary claims to apprehend a mono-personal God, who is the self-existent, all-wise and benevolent one, who made heaven and earth. It affirms God and his universe to sustain the relation of creator and creature and makes them to be separable. It recognizes the valid being of the natural and the supernatural, and the necessary dependent connection of the one on the other. Natural theism views God as entirely external to the universe, the transcendent. Pantheism postulates the Absolute as wholly within the universe, the immanent. Natural theism gives an unresolved dualism. Pantheism a destructive monism. Neither one, therefore, solves the problem.

Again each of the two systems fails to satisfy the human mind. Pantheism completely destroys personality and free will and so thoroughly identifies God and man that the individual is lost in the universal. However logical may be the course of thought and seemingly irresistible the conclusion, nevertheless the deep conviction remains, that God is other than unconscious activity and man superior to the universe in which he dwells. The pantheistic explanation of all things never has afforded the impression of a satisfactory solution of the question old as the history of the world. Even those who have devoted themselves to the working out and over again of the non-theistic theory, at last have not been content with the result attained. In the application of the pantheistic view to an interpretation of human life, they finally reach the most cheerless conclusion and find the best state possible to be the worst. Theism has its argu-

ments for a divine existence old-timed and far-famed, the ontological, the cosmological, the teleological. One claims for its conclusion the force of mathematical demonstration. The others furnish an array of natural facts which suggests the irresistible inference of an unconditioned Absolute. Theology usually begins its discussion concerning God with these proofs for a divine existence. Every treatise on the positive side of the theistic question goes over the same arguments. The latest discussion is but a repetition of the same proofs, with a restating of the same facts. And yet with all this statement and restate-  
ment, thinkers dispute the validity of the ontological, and the sufficiency of the cosmological and teleological arguments for the divine existence. The custom now is to make apology, or to admit that the natural proofs for the being of God give merely an inkling of what he is. These arguments deal with the forms of things, their order, harmony, and final purpose, and show they must have had a maker, but of their essence they determine nothing. But the human mind not only inquires who made the forms, but also seeks to ascertain how the essence came into being. Besides all this, even should the valid conclusion be a mono-personal deity, still difficulties with such a conception of the divine being readily arise and cannot be put down by any process of reasoning, or intuitive insight. A mono-personal God is not the divine existence who is, and hence the mere theistic idea of the supernatural is not the bare conception of the eternal, personal Absolute. Notwithstanding the failure of these systems to fully satisfy the human mind, the fact remains, that pantheism and theism alike enlist the attention of the thinking powers of man and secure an abiding interest. They are not absurdities. They each contain a great truth. Pantheism with its glaring errors preserves a fundamental principle, the divine immanence. Theism with its mistakes maintains with equal emphasis the transcendence of God. These are principles which commend themselves to the reasonableness of thought, and accord with that deep-seated conviction of the real divine existence which human history discloses at every stage of progress. No system destitute of every element of truth has or ever can interest the human mind. However the intellectual

capacity of man has come to be, and however formed, one fact is beyond dispute, namely, that between it and what is true there is an abiding affinity. Its nature perpetually prompts it to search for the verity of things, and its supreme interest ever centers in knowing and possessing truth. If there be long standing theories of error, and systems of philosophy based on false positions, and if these have worked their way into the general thought of man and become wrought into the history of the world and at different times have showed themselves to be over-mastering influences, all this is fact because these theories and systems have running through their structure a great principle which the human mind somehow feels to be true. The irrepressible conviction of the soul is, first, that the God who has real being not only exists before the finite universe, but in the essence of his being is no part of nature, and, second, that he is in and through the universe, actually the life of its existence. Theism on the one hand consequently will always engage the earnest activity of man's knowing powers, while on the other hand Pantheism will awaken the deepest thought of the human understanding. At the same time, each alone cannot cause man in his intellectual search for highest truth to rest in complete satisfaction; neither can the two combined develop in consciousness the true knowledge of the divine Being.

The careful thinker cannot fail to recognize what it is which determines the caste of every type of theistic and antitheistic thought. This is the vital point in the great problem concerning God, man and the universe. Generically it is the same in all systems of science, philosophy and theology; specifically it varies according to the difference between the several schemes of intellectual endeavor. It is itself in fact the problem whose solution the human mind in thinking tries to work out. I mean unity. An examination of natural science quickly shows that this is the ultimate end of every investigation pushed to its farthest reach on this territory. The subtle analysis of complex facts, the tracing of one energy to another, the reducing of the many to the few, and the persistent effort to find the single element to which all others may be referred, and to which they are essentially bound, this unremitting toil, and earnest prying into

the secrets of nature's laboratory, are the determined search of the human mind to find the unity of nature. The final and grandest attainment of science will be the clear and certain knowledge of this fundamental reality in the natural world. In philosophy no less than science unity is the determining principle. It is the web and woof, the soul and marrow of every system which mind has originated. To get the unity is the first step, to defend or verify the unity gives the treatise. The kind conceived is the kind of philosophy developed. Theology likewise is not destitute of this principle. Equally with science and philosophy the guiding truth through its development of religious doctrine is unity. There is at the foundation that which comprehends all the parts of the structure and binds them together in a complete and systematic whole. What this that comprehends and binds together is, constitutes the type of theologic view. It makes the specific theology. In the question concerning God, the inquiry, What is the true unity? demands a clear and certain answer. On the correct reply depends the final solution of the theistic problem. The unknown quantity is the real connection of entities, rather than the reality of their existence. In truth the problem is, given the valid being of God, man and the universe, to find their unity. This must be, otherwise man and the universe could have no possible existence. Absolutely apart from their source they could not exist. To assume they could, would be to make them self-existent. Two or more self-existing entities is an absurdity. Be then what two of the known quantities in this problem may, in any case some kind of connection with the third they must bear. What this actually is solves the question. The Cartesian philosophy began with two certainties, mind and matter. These are distinct in kind, hence incommunicable. Immediate connection between them is impossible. But if they exist in reality then somehow they must be brought together. In what way? Without doubt not directly. Then how? Only one possible mode remains—the intervention of a third existence. This third existence is readily found in the idea of the most perfect Being, who creates both thought and extension and through his

will binds them together. "God is therefore in a certain degree a *deus ex machina*, necessary in order to mediate the conflict of the ego with the extended." Such a mediation is, of course, entirely external.

In the Kantian philosophy the subject of supreme interest is systematic unity. The processes of speculation require a regulative principle. This principle is a law of reason running through the entire operation of thinking and making all the varied parts stand out together in consciousness, a consistent whole. "The greatest systematic unity, and consequently, teleological unity, constitutes the very foundation of the possibility of the most extended employment of human reason. The idea of unity is therefore essentially and indissolubly connected with the nature of our reason. This idea is a legislative one." Without it the universe could not be thought as a whole. The ideal of pure reason, hence, determines the unity of speculative philosophy, in other words, the unity of all knowledge, and, therefore, of all reality in consciousness. A divine being is only an idea of pure reason, and solely necessary in order that the highest systematic unity may be. In the critical philosophy, hence, the supreme unity is ideal.

Pantheism abhors dualism. It at once denies that any object exists as the unknowable. The unknowable in philosophy is an abomination. Reality out of consciousness is impossible. There must be absolute unity. Subject and object as real substances defy connection. If they can have true relation, it must be as modes or manifestations of one and the same existence. This existence is the only substantial reality. The *one* alone has being. Pantheism hence prides itself in having the highest possible unity, which is entirely numerical. Theism knows three realities, mind, matter and God. The first two are derived existence, the third is eternal being. The first two are no part of Deity, yet sustain a necessary connection to him. He made them what they are. God is the unconditioned; he is person, and in his own being is absolutely independent of space and time. Man and the universe are the conditioned, they are therefore objective realities. They have risen into existence, not by emanation or evolution, because God is the transcendent, free per-

sonality. They are his act, the creative act of his almighty power. The material world is irrational; the bond which hence binds creator and creature is dynamic. Man is mental and ethical being, the link which ties him to his original is the power of absolute reason. These various postulates of the true unity are plainly misconceptions. The unity in question cannot be mechanical; if so, then the highest reason for the existence of the divine being is found outside himself, which according to his nature is impossible. Again, this unity cannot be ideal, otherwise matter and mind would exist together and yet at the same time actually be non-co-existent. Furthermore the necessary unity is not numerical. The converse of this radically changes the problem. Thereby two of the three quantities are as to their essential, substantial existence destroyed. The remainder is the one. But this is quantitative, not qualitative unity, and is gotten by high-handed assumption. The clear conviction of common consciousness insists that both matter and mind have real substantial being. The unity on which Pantheism sinks or swims, survives or perishes, belies the very consciousness in which it starts, through which it moves and where it lives and thrives.

God is not a mathematical reality, neither is the only unity that of the equation. Lastly, the needed unity is not dynamic. If it is, then God and his universe never come immediately in contact with each other. Theism urges the reality of a dynamic unity, and on this stakes the validity of its conclusion concerning a personal God. But it needs only to awake to the true situation, to find that it either places the creator so completely outside the universe as to become Deism, or, if it emphasize the reality of the divine so intensely as to make God himself immanent in his creation, it loses his transcendence and becomes Pantheism. Besides, since its highest conception is that of an absolute who has intelligence and will, the only companion which can be for this mono-personality is the universe. If wedded to this companion, as he must be by his creative power, the only unity possible between them is dynamic. If this be virtual presence of the Absolute only, the gateway of Deism opens; if it be maintained to be real presence then the finger-board

points toward the broad road of Pantheism. But Deism with its formal connection of God and the world soon bends its course toward Acosmism and ends in Spinozism. Natural Theism based on the conception of a dynamic unity at last is devoured by its foe, Pantheism.

All systems postulate, as a prime necessity, unity. The three quantities as substantial being in the theistic problem must be retained. Their real connection remains to be found. This is unity, and, to satisfy the conditions of the problem, it must be the highest possible unity. What is it? The negative answer has already been framed. It is neither mechanical, nor ideal, nor numerical, nor dynamic. Positively, the reply is that it must be a unity whose reality is a real existence. The possibility of such existence is ground for the possible being of man and the universe. The actuality of the natural demands this existence to be actual. In the thought of God the universe exists as possible because the highest conceivable unity as itself existence, is known as possible.

As reality objective to himself, it can be and is united to him by a dynamic bond, because the union of the natural and supernatural can be and is itself actual existence. This is the only unity which can satisfy science, furnish a true philosophy, and be the basis for a right theology.

Fact is what is needed. This science requires; with this final philosophy must deal, and on this, as the eternal foundation, theology must stand. Is there the fact, a real existence, which is this unity? If not, then the problem is indeterminate. Kant's strictures on Theism, philosophically considered, are sound. Pantheism and Theism alike fail. Since, therefore, neither logical thought, nor rational intuition finds the true unity, we must turn elsewhere, and ask, does religion furnish the needed fact? Heathenism certainly does not, because it always ends either in deifying nature, or absorbing the natural in the supernatural. Judaism and Mohammedanism are in the same condition, because with their basis of a mono-personal God they stand on Deistic ground. There remains yet one other system, Christianity. In this stands out in boldest relief and highest prominence, the long sought and the essential fact, the fact of

facts: the Incarnation of the Logos. Jesus Christ is the unity of God and the universe. In the compass of his being man on one side is material, on the other rational. The forces of his body are the energies of the physical world. The endowments of his rational nature are the powers of the finite spiritual universe. The material universe and the spiritual are joined together in immortal wedlock. Their union is man. God said, "Let us make man in our image and according to our likeness. And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." The unity of material nature and finite spiritual being is a real existence. This is man. His creation did not consist in making the elements of his being, for these previously existed, but in uniting these to be a real, living existence, a person. Man, therefore, is the realization of the highest possible unity between the material and the finite spiritual. In consequence he stands in being at the head of the universe. He is God's masterpiece of handiwork. Without him creation would be unfinished, not as to quantity, it is true, but as to quality. It is, however, the quality which is fundamental. Without the quality creation could not be a thought of God and certainly not a reality. Without the idea of man in the consciousness of God, the universe as it exists could not be a possible conception, much less an objective reality. As above said, the realization of the highest possible unity between the material and the finite spiritual is man. This is not dynamic unity, but a real, living union of heterogeneous elements,—a personal existence. It remains yet that man should be united with God. If the union between the material and finite rational is a real, personal existence, the inference certainly is that the union between God and man must likewise be a real personal existence, on the one side divine, on the other human. Christianity says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God. And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." This is the highest, truest unity possible, and finds its reality in him whose person is the son of God and the son of man. What man is to finite spirit and matter, Jesus Christ is to God and the universe, their unity. In him God and his crea-

tion are actually, absolutely one. No Christ in idea, no universe in thought. A universe in fact, a Christ in reality.

The Logos incarnate is the only possibility of the existing universe; the existing universe foretells with infallible certainty the ultimate existence of the incarnation. The ideal of pure reason, the highest regulative principle of true thinking, is not a mono-personal absolute, but the Christ of Christianity. The one which philosophic thought demands is not the mathematical unit, but Jesus of the gospel. The Pantheistic absolute is the abstract of Jesus Christ. The incarnate God is the true basis for theistic *a priori* thought. The sum of all teleology is the divine Nazarene, and he in the concreteness of his being must be the initial point of the *a posteriori* mode of theistic thinking. Pantheism affirms the only actuality to be absolute being, because God, man, and the universe must be in absolute Unity, and absolute being is this unity. Christianity gives this real, most perfect unity in an actual living existence, the elements of whose being are very God and very man. Pantheism is founded on the all-embracing truth, the unity of existence, but in the form of an abstraction. Christianity possesses the great truth of God, the truth of man's being and the truth of the universe in the person of the incarnate Logos, who himself declared, "I am the truth," the whole kingdom of truth, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In the being of man is given the reality of the substantial existence of matter; in the same being that of mind, of spirit. In the being of Jesus Christ is exhibited the substantial existence of man on the one hand and the substantial existence of God on the other. The Christian view, therefore, is, first, all-comprehending; second, the impregnable position; third, the irrepressible truth; fourth, the final philosophy; and, lastly, the true and only true theology. It is all-comprehending, because Jesus Christ is the real, living union of God, man and the universe. It is the impregnable position, because by the incarnation it maintains the actual being of the three quantities in the great problem, and the true dependence of two of those quantities on the third. It is the irrepressible truth, because the Word made flesh is the

real truth, and not a reflection of it. It is the final philosophy, because the divine person, Jesus of Nazareth, is not a speculative idea, but a certain fact. It is the only true theology, because the God-man is not on the one hand a mere manifestation of the divine being, but he is divine being, a theophany; on the other hand he is not the mere appearance of human nature, but he is in reality human nature, the second Adam. This view, it can readily be perceived, makes the incarnation not primarily necessary for redemption only, but pre-eminently necessary for the existence of a universe with finite rational beings.

Whatever universe in essence there may be, the same condition for its existence holds, namely, the real unity, as being, of God and that universe. On the other supposition, namely, that incarnation which exhibits and is the highest, most perfect union between God and finite being, is for redemption solely, in the possible case of no sin having arisen in the history of moral creatures, the absolute union between the natural and the supernatural, God and man never could be realized. The union between them would be eternally imperfect, unconsummated.

Primarily the incarnation is the metaphysical, cosmical principle of the universe. The life of the incarnate Logos will, however, be determined in its manifestation by surrounding circumstances and external conditions. If the incarnation exists as fact in a world of sin, the history of the incarnate one will be characterized by humiliation and atonement. If the incarnation exists in a realm of holiness the history of the incarnate God will be characterized by ineffable glory. The fact stands that each is a reality. God was originally manifest in sinful flesh; he is now manifest in a glorified humanity. Wherefore, it appears that incarnation continues to have significance after redemptive work is finished. If the incarnate Logos is the perfecter of the world through redemption, what hinders that he should be the perfecter of the world were the case such that redemption would not be needed? If redemption be the end of incarnation, when the former is completed, what further need of the latter? Why continue? Is the God-man seated at the right hand of the divine majesty to be nothing through the eternal ages, except a spectacle of saving grace? Assuredly the Church teaches no

such doctrine. The received view has always considered the incarnation to be conditioned by circumstances. This is true so far as to the course its life must take. In itself considered, as the supreme unity, it is above all circumstances and independent. It is conditional that circumstances may be. Logically, as idea, it is first; in time it can occur anywhere in the progress of cosmical development. In the scheme of redemption, atonement is first. In the execution of the scheme instead of occurring as objective fact immediately at man's fall, it was postponed on account of circumstances four thousand years. Neither did it take place at the beginning of the incarnate life among men, but at its close. In the mind of the Godhead incarnation eternally existed as real, first, as the fundamental principle of a universe, second, as the only sufficient plan for meeting the direst emergency which might arise in the moral world.

Since the emergency has arisen, and it is man who is involved in it, the plan will attract chief attention, both in the communication which God makes and in the historic life of the incarnate divinity. In this remedial method vicarious suffering and death, the climax of it, will be the fact most prominent.

Sin is separation from God, the disunion between God and man; its purpose is the utter destruction of the human creature; this is absolute death. Since the incarnate Logos is the union of divinity and nature, sin is the attempt to undermine and reduce to nihility the ground principle of creation. In the destruction of the creatureman, it means the reducing of the universe to eternal chaos, the everlasting overthrow of the Logos.

But the overthrow of the Logos is the overthrow of the universe, and the driving back of the divine creative and preserving energy to pure subjective reality. Sin, hence, first explores the universe to find the being who is its unity, that it may take him captive. Success so far is only partial triumph. There is still a higher, all-embracing unity. The search now is for the being who is the union supreme, and when found the great battle begins. This being will sometime appear, become manifest, not as an abstract principle, but as a real, living person, the first-born of every creature. During four thousand years sin searched the generations of man, the cosmical unity, for the incarnate Lo-

gos, until at length it found him in the wilderness of Judea, hard by the banks of the Jordan. Here the mighty struggle begins; through three years it continues, deepens in intensity and desperateness at every progressive stage, until it reaches the summit of Calvary, and there culminates in death grapple. The God-man dies, but his expiring agony completes the wedlock of eternal righteousness and eternal love in saving grace. Sin abounded. Grace now much more abounds. But the last enemy still disputes the kingdom. On the morning of the third day, however, after the struggle on Calvary, the incarnate Logos walks forth from the dominion of death, the resurrection and the life. He that was dead is alive, and behold he is alive forevermore. A little while afterward the divine Nazarene returns whence he came. The eternal gates lift up their heads, the everlasting doors open wide, and as the monarch of the ages he enters the heavenly domain, traveling in the greatness of his strength, and takes his rightful place on the divine throne, the king of glory, the Lord of the Hosts, strong and mighty in battle. There he is forever, not merely the world's redeeming mediator, but also its perfecting mediator.

The grand end of the universe is perfection. This end will be contemplated whether sin does or does not exist. In either case it can be reached alone by the fullest self-revelation of God. But this self-revelation of the divine being is only possible through the Logos, for in him is the fulness of the God-head, and he is the self-revealing principle of divine nature. But this perfection of the whole creation in its life cannot be merely ideal. In that case it would be eternally without objective reality. But highest truth is not in the ideal, but the real. Perfection of the unity of the two worlds of finite being will hence stand out in real objective existence. This existence must be the Logos as he has taken up into himself the nature of man, become an original reality, and made God, man and the uniyerse to be in actual unity.

The being of God in its essence is not physical and logical merely, but pre-eminently ethical. The divine being is free spirit, he is love. It has been well said, "The incarnation of

God as the Logos is not physically necessary to God. God does not need in himself incarnation in order to his self-realization. Whilst in his internal being potency and act are given as eternally alike, the incarnation is a work of the will of love." "From the beginning he has willed the world to himself, in order to communicate himself thereto, to be manifest for it and in it and to dwell in it for its glorification and blessedness." "The God-man is the center of the history of the world. He sends his rays backward and forward to enlighten, because by relation to him everything is organically combined into the unity of a universal plan." Consequently, Christianity furnishes the only true conception of God. This true conception involves the reality of the Logos. In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was God. The incarnate Logos is "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation: for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth; all things have been created through him, and unto him; he is before all things, and in him all things consist." Pantheism teaches divine immanence. Pure Theism says the dynamic presence of its mono-personal God is in and through the universe. But the true and real immanence is neither the immanence of Pantheism nor of pure Theism, but the immanence of the Logos who created all things and who in the being of Jesus Christ is actually immanent in the universe. This is the immanence which Christianity teaches.

The Logos is the creator and sustainer of the worlds. "Of him, and through him and to him are all things." The paraphrase of Bishop Lightfoot on Colossians fitly expresses the view already indicated. "The Logos incarnate is the perfect image, the visible representation of the unseen God: He is the first-born, the absolute heir of the Father, begotten before the ages: the Lord of the universe by virtue of primogeniture, and by virtue also of creative agency. For in him and through him the whole world was created, things in heaven and things on earth, things visible to the outward eye, things cognizable by the inward perception. His supremacy is absolute and universal. He is first and he is last. He is pre-existent and self-existent before all the worlds. And in him as the binding and sustaining power,

universal nature coheres and subsists." This last expression tells the true immanence. It is the immanence of the Logos whose home is in God and also in the world. Through the eternal Logos God is everywhere in and through the universe, its life and preserving power. In him it lives and moves and has being. As through the Logos God made the worlds so through the Logos and only through him God is immanent in the things that are. For a like reason the true and real transcendence of God is secured. Neither Pantheism, nor pure Theism, nor any system of human thought ever has or ever can teach the true doctrine of transcendence and immanence. But error in this doctrine is misconception of the God who actually exists. Christianity alone furnishes the right conception. Through the incarnation, hence, is revealed the true divine existence. This is not mere absolute substance, or mono-personal, infinite existence, but a trinity of persons of one essence, co-eternal, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This is the true conception of God. Every other view is a misconception. God, if thought correctly, must be thought as trinitarian.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE LUTHERAN ORIGIN OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

By JOHN G. MORRIS, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

The Augsburg Confession is the doctrinal *magna charta* of all Protestantdom. Just as all free nations of the earth have drawn their principles of civil government from the English "Great Charter of Liberties," extorted from King John in 1215, so nearly all Protestant organizations have based their Formulas of Faith upon the greater "Bill of Rights," proclaimed in Augsburg, 1530, during the reign of Charles V.

The Augsburg Confession was the first Confession of Faith adopted after the Reformation was begun, and the substance of it and, in many instances its precise language, have been incorporated into every similar Declaration, with the exception of

two perhaps, adopted by other Communions since that day. It is the standard of pure Protestantism, and under this banner our triumphs have been achieved.

"Its influence extends far beyond the Lutheran Church. It struck the key note to other evangelical Confessions and strengthened the cause of the Reformation everywhere. It is, to a certain extent also, the Confession of the Reformed and the so-called union churches in Germany, namely, with the explanation and modifications of the author himself, in the edition of 1540. In this qualified sense, either expressed or understood, the Augsburg Confession was frequently signed by Reformed divines and princes, even by John Calvin, while ministering to the Church at Strasburg, and as delegate to the Conference in Ratisbon, 1541; by Farel and Beza, at the Conference in Worms, 1557; by the Calvinists, at Bremen, 1562; by Frederick III. (Reformed) Elector of the Palatinate, at the Convention of Princes in Nuremberg, 1561, and again at the Diet of Augsburg, 1566; by John Sigismund of Brandenburg in 1614."—*Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I. 235.*

It is our purpose, in this paper, to show to what extent the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and indirectly all other Protestant Confessions are indebted to the Augsburg Confession, as well as to note the influence which the Lutherans of Germany had upon the English divines of those days in forming their theological basis, not only in their Declaration of Faith, but also in the completion of their Liturgy and Homilies.

The testimony shall be principally derived from eminent divines of the English Church, accompanied by that of other writers of established reputation. All these quotations are taken from the original sources in the Peabody and Whittingham libraries of this city, and have been verified, so that no citation is made at second hand.

In the year 1804, Archbishop Laurence, a distinguished dignitary of the Church of England, preached eight sermons before the University of Oxford, on "An attempt to illustrate those articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly considered Calvinistical." These sermons constitute volume VIII. of the Bampton Lectures; the edition from which these

quotations are made, is that of Oxford, 1820. The discourses are illustrated by learned and extensive notes.

The nature of the sermons may be inferred from the themes which are here given. I. The General Principles of the Reformation from its commencement to the period when our Articles were composed, shewn *to be of a Lutheran tendency*. II. The same *tendency* pointed out in the Articles themselves, as deducible from the history of their composition. III. On Original Sin, as maintained by the Scholastics, the Lutherans and our own Reformers. IV. On the tenet of the Schools respecting merit *de congruo*, and that of the Lutherans in opposition to it. V. The Article of "Free Will" and of "Works before Sanctification," explained in connection with the preceding controversy. VI. On the Scholastic doctrine of Justification, the Lutheran and that of our own Church. VII. The outline of the Predestinarian system stated, as taught in the Schools, and as Christianized by Luther and Melanchthon. VIII. The Seventeenth Article considered in conformity with the sentiments of the latter, and elucidated by our baptismal service.

In sermon I., p. 12, the Archbishop says:

"In this country, where the light of literature could not be concealed, nor the love of truth suppressed, Lutheranism found numerous proselytes, who were known by the appellation of 'The men of the new learning.' This was particularly the case after the rupture with the see of Rome."

Henry VIII., at that time King of England, undertook to reform the doctrine of the English Church, and, the more effectually to propagate the new principles in his dominions and to accelerate the arduous task in which he was engaged, he invited the ever memorable Melanchthon to come to his assistance. That he did not solicit the co-operation of Luther on this occasion, should not, perhaps, be solely attributed to his personal dislike of the Reformer; he well knew that the Protestant Princes themselves, at the most critical period, had manifested a greater partiality for Melanchthon, and hence he urged the latter to come and help him, but he refused.

"After the commencement of our Reformation, Melanchthon was repeatedly pressed personally to assist in completing it,

both in Henry's and Edward's reign. In a letter dated March, 1534, he says, 'Ego, jam alteris literis in Angliam vocor.' Ep. p. 717, and again October of the following year: 'Ego rursus in Angliam non solum literis sed legationibus et vocor et exerceor.' Ep. p. 732. Ed. Lond. 1642. The cause, however, why he did not come then, as at first he intended, (for the Elector of Saxony had consented to his journey, and Luther was anxious for it,) he explains in another letter to Camerarius: "Anglicæ profectionis cura liberatus sum. Postquam enim tragici casus in Anglia acciderunt, magna conciliorum mutatio secuta est. Posterior regina (viz., Anna Boleyn), magis accusata quam convicta adulterii, ultimo suppicio affecto est." Epist. lib. IV. 187. In 1538, he was again solicited. During the short reign of Edward, solicitations of a similar nature appear to have been frequent." Laurence, pp. 195-99.

In letters to Camerarius in September, 1535, he says, "Ab Anglis bis vocatus sum sed expecto tertias literas," and again in April, 1536, "Et sic me Angli exercent vix ut respirare liceat." This was when he was holding almost daily conference with the English Ambassadors in Wittenberg. Well may Browne in the Introduction to his Exposition of the 39 Articles, say, "Melanchthon seems to have known Henry's character too well to wish to become his counsellor."

Laurence proceeds to say, "Melanchthon \* \* possessed every requisite to render truth alluring and reformation respectable, and hence upon him in preference the Princes of Germany conferred the honor of compiling the public profession of their Faith. When Henry therefore applied for the assistance of this favorite divine, by seeking the aid of one to whom Lutheranism had been indebted for her Creed, he places beyond suspicion, the nature of that change which he meditated. \* \* Some popular instructions were either published (before this) or sanctioned by royal authority, which, with the exception of a few points only, *bathed the spirit of Lutheranism*. Of this no one at all conversant with the subject can for a moment doubt, who examines with attention the contents of what were at that time denominated *The Bishop's Book* and *The King's Book*, the two important publications of the day."—p. 195.

Hardwicke in his *Articles of Religion* says, "As early as the Spring of 1534, Melanchthon was invited to come over and assist in the *reforming of the English Church*,—an invitation which appears to have been warmly supported by the King on many subsequent occasions."

Seckendorf, Lib. iii. §66, add. 1. Frankf. 1692, gives us an extract of Henry's letter :

"In 1538, Henry wrote as follows to the Elector of Saxony, 'Pro his, quae feliciter agi coepta sunt, felicius absoluendis concludendisque expectamus ut Dominum Philippum Melanchthon in cuius excellenti eruditione et sane judicio a bonis omnibus multo spes reposita est, doctosque alios et probos viros, primo quoque tempore, ad nos mittat.'

Melanchthon was finally appointed professor in Cambridge (May 1553) but owing to the death of Edward never came into residence.

"Melanchthon dedicated his *Commentary on the Epistles to Henry VIII.*, who sent him (upon it) a present of 200 crowns and wrote him a letter full of particular esteem and assurance that he would always assist him in those pious labors, dated from Winchester, 1535."—*Burnet, Hist. English Reformation, III. 211.*

Ledderhose in his life of Melanchthon says, it was his *Loci Communes* which he dedicated to the King. He also wrote him a letter, highly commending him personally and dilating on the necessity of a universal reformation of the Church. This letter may be seen in the Appendix of Strype, No. xciv., Oxford, 1822, and in Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, 227.

"We have before seen that Henry VIII. was particularly anxious that Melanchthon should visit England, and the same proposal was made to that reformer from Cranmer in the reign of Edward VI.: but this object was never accomplished. He appears to have been consulted in 1535 concerning the articles which were published during the next year; and the definition of *Justification* there given is probably derived from the *Loci Communes* of this author, *in the whole of these articles the ideas and language of the Lutheran divines have been closely followed. Many of the forty-two articles owe their origin to the same source,*

and even those which cannot be traced with certainty exhibit a correspondence with the general opinions of the German divines." \* \* \*

"If this examination of the question shall surprise those who generally esteem the *authoritative documents of the Church of England original compositions*, if it shall seem to detract from the value which is generally attached to the labors of Archbishop Cranmer and his colleagues, let it be remembered that the sacred subject on which these works were drawn up is the only one in which originality is the worst of faults." \* \* \*

"At the commencement of the Reformation in England, our reformers naturally cast their eyes on two standards of faith—on that of the Church of Rome and that of the Lutheran churches which had already discarded the errors of the papal court. The rule, then, which sound reason would seem to dictate, is, that in those points wherein the Church of England found it necessary to differ from that of Rome, it should refer to the newly established churches, and follow them as far as they were consistent with the Scripture: and where that was taught by the Lutherans appeared to be questionable, the Church of England would either borrow the expression of its opinions from some other Reformed Church, or construct its own articles directly from the word of God. \* \* In our articles are contained the great truths of Christianity, which we hold in common with the Church of Rome; there are many more which are derived from the *Lutheran Church*." \* \* \*

"There is every reason for applauding the conduct of Archbishop Cranmer and admiring our own standard, because they so nearly resemble the works of the same sort which have preceded them; and to rejoice that the *documents of our Church are not new*, but intended transcripts of those which our fore-runners have established." \* \* \*

"With regard to the Confession of Augsburg, there is not only a general agreement in doctrine but in many places the very words of the one are transferred into the other."—*Short, Hist. of the Church of England*, pp. 164, 165. See Short, p. 168, for a comparison between the articles of the Augsburg Confession and the 39 Articles.

"In 1538, in consequence of conferences between Cranmer and the German divines, a body of 13 articles were drawn up in great measure agreeing with the *Confession of Augsburg*."—*Browne, Exposition of the 39 Articles, Introd., vi., London, 1850.*

The following extract is from Schaff's Creeds of Christendom:

"Under Edward VI. the influence of the Melanchthonian theology as embodied in the Augsburg Confession (1530) and the Suabian Confession (1552) became more apparent and can be clearly traced in Cranmer's earlier writings, in some of the Articles of Religion and in those parts of the Book of Common Prayer which were borrowed from the "Consultation" of Archbishop Herman of Cologne, compiled by Bucer and Melanchthon (1543). Hence the English Church has been called sometimes by Lutheran divines, *Ecclesia Lutherisans*."—Vol. I., 600.

\* \* \* \* \*

A short code of doctrines had been drawn up long before the death of Henry, with the title "Articles devised by the King's Highness Majesty to stablish Christian Quietness and Unity and to avoid contentious opinions, which Articles be also approved by the Consent and Determination of the whole Clergy of the Realm (1536)." On this subject the Archbishop says:

"Nor is complete originality even here to be met with: the sentiment and many of the very expressions, thus borrowed, being themselves evidently derived from another source, *The Confession of Augsburg*.

"The offices of our Church (after Edward had ascended the throne) were completely reformed, (which before had been but partially attempted,) after the temperate System of Luther, \* \* nor were any alterations of importance, one point alone excepted, made at their subsequent revision. At the same period also, the first book of Homilies was composed, which, although equally Lutheran, \* \* has remained without the slightest

---

\*For further information, see Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*, II., 122. Burnet, *Hist. Ref.* I. add. N. Fuller, *Ch. Hist.*, XVI. B. V. 93.

emendation to the present day. \* \* Cranmer, who had never concealed the bias of his sentiments, now more openly and generally avowed them. He translated a *Lutheran Catechism*, (1547), \* \* dedicated it to the King and recommended it in the strongest terms. \* \* The opinions of the Primate (Cranmer) were at that time perfectly *Lutheran*, and although he afterward changed them in one single point, in other respects, they remain unaltered."—p. 17.

"As little reason is there to question his ability, as his personal influence, his personal influence as his attachment to Lutheranism. This latter point seems beyond all controversy."—p. 24.

"On the whole, therefore, the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted, ought not to remain in doubt. With these the mind of him to whom we are chiefly indebted for the salutary measure, was deeply impressed, and *in conformity with them* was our Liturgy drawn up and the first book of our Homilies, all that were at that time composed."

"That *our Articles* were in general, *founded upon the same principles*, I shall in the next place endeavor to prove."

"Our Reformers, indeed, had they been so disposed, might have turned their attention to the novel establishment at Geneva, which Calvin had just succeeded in forming according to his wishes, might have imitated its singular institutions and inculcated its peculiar doctrines, but this they declined, viewing it perhaps as a faint luminary, \* \* this they might have done, but they rather chose to give reputation to their opinions and stability to their system by adopting \* \* *Lutheran sentiments* and expressing themselves in *Lutheran language*."—p. 25.

"During the negotiations with the Lutheran divines (1535-38) held partly at Wittenberg, partly at Lambeth, an agreement consisting of 13 articles was drawn up in Latin at London in the Summer of 1538, which did not receive the sanction of the King but was made use of in the following reign as the basis of several of the 42 articles. \* \* They are based upon the Augsburg Confession, some passages being almost literally copied from the same."—Schaff, Vol. I., 612.

"These articles, 42 in number, the first that were constructed

by the Church of England on the principles of the Reformation, were indebted to the clear theological distinctions of Melanchthon and other reformers in Germany and *derived more especially from the Confession of Augsburg.*"

"But some progress had already been made in this work by the English divines during the reign of Henry VIII. \* \* In compliance with his earnest wishes and with the view of promoting other important objects as well as an agreement with religious sentiments, a deputation of three eminent reformers had been sent from the Protestant Princes of Germany in the year 1538, who immediately on their arrival in England, joined with Cranmer and others in drawing up articles of religion on the model generally adopted by their own countrymen."

—*Cardwell, Synodalia, Vol. I. p. 1.*

For these 42 articles and in parallel columns with the Elizabethan articles, see Hardwicke, App. III., 277.

"No small part of the fresh matter in the Articles of 1536 was borrowed from a *Lutheran* document, itself in turn an echo of the Augsburg Confession. It bears the title of the Confession of Wurtemberg."

This *Confessio Wurtembergica* was drawn up by Brentius, in the name of his Prince, Duke Christopher, who had resolved to send delegates to the Council of Trent. The Emperor had invited the Protestant States to send delegates, promising them full protection. Brentius prepared the Confession for that Council, as Melanchthon had drawn up the *Confessio Saxonica* for the same purpose. Brentius was approved by a commission of ten Suabian divines and by the City of Strasburg. It was also approved at Wittenberg as agreeing with Melanchthon's.—*Schaff's Creeds, &c., I. 341.*

The Archbishop begins his second Sermon in these words:

"On a former occasion I endeavored to prove, that the established doctrines of our Church, from the commencement of the Reformation to the period when our Articles first appeared, were chiefly *Lutheran*; to point out, that the original plan was ultimately adhered to, and that in the composition of our national creed, a general conformity with the same principles was scrupu-

pulously observed, will be the object of the present lecture."—p. 29.

"At the commencement of Edward's reign, it appears that Melanchthon was consulted upon this interesting subject. He was then alone at the head of the Lutherans, universally respected as the head of their much applauded Confession."—p. 36.

There was some delay in the completion of the Thirty-Nine Articles, owing to various causes, and the Archbishop continues: "Among other reasons which may be assigned for this delay, is it not possible that one might have been the hope of obtaining the valuable assistance of Melanchthon, who was repeatedly, in Edward's, as well as in Henry's reign, invited to fix his residence in this country?"—p. 39.

"If it be too much to conjecture that the delay was not imputable to the wish of submitting them to his personal inspection, and improving them by his consummate wisdom, the coincidence nevertheless of the time, during which they were postponed, with that of his much hoped for arrival here, cannot altogether escape observation. \* \*

"Many of the argumentations upon points of doctrine at the same time introduced, were not only of a *Lutheran tendency*, but couched in the very expressions of the *Lutheran Creed*."

"Considering them, therefore, even in their rude outline, but more particularly in their perfect state, we discover, that, in various parts of their composition, Cranmer studiously kept in view, that boast of Germany and pride of the Reformation, the *Confession of Augsburg*."

"If we, then, duly weigh the facts, which have been stated, and the consequences which seem to result from them, we shall not, perhaps, be at a loss to determine, from what quarter we are likely to collect the best materials for illustrating the Articles of our Church. We perceive, that in the first compilation many prominent passages were taken from the Augsburg, and in the second place, from the Wurtemberg, Confession. \* \* These were the *Creeds of the Lutherans*."—p. 46.

"It may then, perhaps, appear, as well from internal as external evidence, whence Cranmer derived the principles of our national Creed. \* \* It may appear, that from the *Lutherans*,

who had been his masters in theology, he had learned \* \* almost everything, which he deemed great and good in reformation."—p. 52.

With regard to the present Liturgy of the Church of England, the Archbishop says :

"In the year 1543, Melanchthon and Bucer drew up a Reformed Liturgy \* \* for the use of the Archbishoprick of Cologne. From this work, the occasional services of our own Church, where they vary from the ancient forms, *seem principally to have been derived*. It was not, however, itself original, but in a great degree borrowed from a Liturgy established at Nurenberg. \* \* *All our offices bear evident marks of having been partly taken from this work.* \* \* In our Baptismal service, the resemblance between the two productions is particularly striking."—p. 144.

Proctor in his History of the Book of Common Prayer, London, 1870, p. 41, thus speaks :

"Of all the foreigners who were engaged in the work of Reformation, Melanchthon had the greatest influence both in the general reformation of the English Church, and in the composition of the English Book of Common Prayer, where it differed from the mediæval Service Books."

"Melanchthon was repeatedly invited into England, and it seems probable that his opinion, supported by his character and learning, had great influence on Cranmer's mind. As early as March, 1534, he had been invited more than once; so that the attention of Henry VIII. and Cranmer had been turned towards him, *before they proceeded to* any doctrinal reformation. The formularies of faith which were put forth in the reign of Henry, are supposed to have originated in his advice. On the death of Bucer, (Feb. 28, 1551) the professorship of Divinity at Cambridge was offered to Melanchthon and after many letters he was at last formally appointed (May, 1553). It is, perhaps, needless to add that he never came to England."\* \* \*

"The first book was largely indebted to Luther, who had

\*For a fuller account of the negotiation with Melanchthon to go to England, see Hardwick's Articles of Religion, 1859, p. 53, Strype, Eccles. Mem. I. 225-98.

composed a form of service in 1533, for the use of Brandenburg and Nurenberg. This was taken by Melanchthon and Bucer as their model when they were invited (1543) by Hermann, Prince Archbishop of Cologne, to draw up a Scriptural form of doctrine and worship for his subjects. This book contained 'Directions for the public service and administration of the Sacraments, with forms of prayer and a litany.' \* \* The *Litany presents many striking affinities with the amended English Litany of 1544*. The exhortations in the Communion Service and portions of the Baptismal Services, *are mainly due to this book*, through which the influence of Luther may be traced in our Prayer Book." \* \*

"They (the Thirteen Articles of 1538) not only indicate the disposition of our leading Reformers to acquiesce in the dogmatic statements which had been put forward in the Augsburg Confession, but have also a prospective bearing of still more importance, as in many ways, the ground work of articles now in use. No one can deny that the compilers of the Forty-Two Articles in the reign of Edward VI. drew largely from the Lutheran formulary of 1530."—*Ibid. 61.*\*

"In the first year of the new reign (1548), he (Cranmer) had 'set forth' an English Catechism of a distinctly *Lutheran* stamp, indeed originally composed in German and translated into Latin, by Justus Jonas, the Elder, one of Luther's bosom friends."—*Ibid. 68.*

"With reference more particularly to the Sacrament of Baptism, the baptismal office of our own Reformers was derived in no small measure from Luther's *Taufbüchlein*, itself the offspring and reflexion of far older manuals."—*Ibid. 95.*

Hardwick, in *Articles of Religion*, Cambridge 1859, p. 13, says:

"That Confession (the Augsburg) is most intimately connected

\*For a parallel between the Augsburg Confession and the XIII. Articles here spoken of, see Hardwick, p. 62, seq., and for a parallel between the Augs. Confession and the Forty-Two Articles of 1553, see Appendix III., Hardwick, and for a parallel between the Augs. Conf. and the Thirty-Nine Articles, as finally agreed upon in 1571, see Annotated Prayer Book.

with the progress of the English Reformation ; and besides the influence which it cannot fail to have exerted by its rapid circulation in our country, *it contributed directly, in a large degree, to the construction of the public formularies of Faith* put forward by the Church of England. The XIII. Articles, drawn up, as we shall see, in 1538, were based *almost entirely on the language of the great Germanic Confession*, while a similar expression of respect is no less manifest in the Articles of Edward VI., and consequently in that series which is binding now upon the conscience of the English Clergy."

"A perception of this common basis in religious matters, aided by strong reasons of diplomacy, suggested the commencement of negotiations with the "princes of the Augsburg Confession," as early as the year 1535. The first English envoy sent among them was Robert Barnes, the victim, only five years later, of his predilection for the new opinions, &c."—*Ibid. 53.*

"But while (King) Henry was thus faltering on the subject of communion with the German League, a conference had been opened on the spot between the English delegates and a committee of Lutheran theologians. Luther himself was a party to it from the first and Melanchthon came soon afterwards (Jan. 15, 1536). The place of meeting was at Wittenberg in the house of Pontanus (Brück), the Senior Chancellor of Saxony, where Fox dilated on the *Lutheran tendencies of England*, and more especially of his royal master."\*—*Ibid. 55.*

"Afterwards Henry begged 'the Princes of the Augsburg Confession' to send to England a legation of divines (including his peculiar favorite Melanchthon) to confer on the disputed points with a committee of English theologians. \* \* The whole course of the discussion was apparently determined by the plan and order of the Augsburg Confession."—*Ibid. 56, 57.*

The result of the Conference with the Germans was a 'boke' (book) which is manifestly founded on the Confession of Augs-

\*See Seckendorf, *Comment. De Lutherismo*, Lib. II. §xxxix for an account of certain articles of religion which were drawn up by the mediating party in 1535 and '36. Of those, one article has reference to the Lord's Supper, and is merely an expanded version of the Augsburg Confession.

burg, often following it very closely. \* \* *The article on the Lord's Supper is word for word the same.*"—*Ibid. 60.*

"About the same time Cranmer (1548) put forth his Catechism. This work was translated from a German Catechism used in Nurenberg, through the medium of a Latin version made by Justus Jonas.—*Ibid. 142.*

"In 1535, Fox, Heath and Barnes were sent Ambassadors to Smalcalde, where proposals were made to them by the Protestant Princes, that the King should approve the Confession of Augsburg."—*Ibid. 110.*

"Whatever use he (Cranmer, 1536) might have made of the Helvetic Confession in forming his own opinions, he does not appear to have introduced it into the work in which he was engaged (preparing the Forty-Two Articles), but with regard to the Augsburg Confession (1530, printed 1531 and re-published with alteration 1540), there is not only a general agreement in doctrine, but in many places *the very words of the one are transferred into the other.*"—*Ibid. 268.*

"It appears that he (Archb. Parker of Canterbury, 1559) had himself been recasting the Forty-Two Articles of King Edward \* \* and that he added to the Articles, which had been mainly drawn from the earlier Lutheran Creeds, some new clauses obtained from the more recent confession of Wurtemberg."—*Cardwell, Synodalia, Oxford 1842, 2 vols., vol. I., p. 35.*

Bishop Bull, in his "Apology for the Harmony and its Author," bound with his "Examen Censurae," p. 292, Oxford, 1845, says in reply to Dr. Tully:

"Dr. Tully now hastens to the Augsburg Confession. Where, in the first place, he finds fault with me because I called *that the greatest of all the Reformed Confessions, not excepting even our own Anglican one.* \* \* I only said the same thing that many learned men both of our own and foreign countries have said before me, and who also highly honored our Church. Now the Augsburg Confession is deservedly *called the greatest* for more than one reason. In the first place, (not to say anything of its most excellent and learned principal author, Phil. Melanchthon,) *it was the first of all Confessions.* Next, when it was published, it was approved of by the consent of almost all, if not of all the

Reformed Churches, Universities and Doctors. Lastly, it is still received and held in certain kingdoms and great principalities and free States. The Doctor, moreover, is offended, because I said that the Heads of our Church had followed and imitated this Confession. *But what can be clearer than this?* The first article of our Confession is taken almost word for word from the first of the Augsburg. Our second is clearly copied from the third of Augsburg. Also the sixteenth in ours \* \* openly imitates, towards the end, the anathemas of the eleventh in the Augsburg, as our twenty-fifth does the thirteenth in the Augsburg. Again, in our homilies how often must the attentive reader who is acquainted with Melanchthon's writings, *hear him speaking!* Add to which \* \* that Hooper of blessed memory \* \* was in the habit of copying long passages from Melanchthon's writings, *almost word for word.*"

Bishop Bull, in his *Harmonia Apostolica*, Oxford, 1842, pp. 197 seq., says, "This is the same as is meant in the Confession of Augsburg, which as it is the most noble and ancient of all the Reformed Churches, so both here and in other places, the heads of our Church have followed it, that whoever is ignorant of it can scarcely conceive the true meaning of our articles."

"The (39) Articles are Catholic in the oecumenical doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, like all Protestant Confessions of the Reformation Period and they state those doctrines partly in the very words of the two *Lutheran documents*, viz., *The Augsburg Confession* and the Wurtemberg Confession."

"They are Augustinian in the Anthropological and Soteriological doctrines of Free Will, Sin and Grace, herein likewise agreeing with the Continental Reformers, especially the Lutheran."—Schaff, Vol. I., 622.

For a comparison of the Augsburg Confession (1530) the Thirteen Articles of 1538 and the Thirty-Nine of 1563, and also a comparison of the Elizabethan Revision of the 39 articles with the Confessio Wurtemburgica, see Schaff, Vol. I., 624.

"It has been shewn by Archbishop Laurence and others, that the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, especially the Confession of Augsburg, were the chief sources to which Cranmer was in-

debted for the articles of 1552. He did not servilely follow but yet made copious use of them."—*Browne, Exposition*, p. x.

"As Cranmer had derived much from the Confession of Augsburg, so he took several clauses from the Confession of Wurtemberg.—*Ibid.* See Laurence, Vol. 8, 233.

"It appears that one of (Archbishop) Parker's (1559) earliest labors was directed towards a recasting of the Articles of Religion. In this work he was guided like Cranmer in a great degree, by Lutheran Formularies."—*Ibid., London, 1858, Introduction*.

"Archb. Laurence labours in the Bampton Lectures of 1804 to show that they (the 39 Articles) are *purely Lutheran*."—Forbes, Expt. of the 39 Art., Oxford, 1809, I. vii.

"Archb. Laurence has noticed a correspondence between the article on Justification and the definition contained in Melanchthon's *Loci Theologici*, which together with the Lutheran tendency of some other articles would point to the influence of Cranmer and the Reformers' party. Prof. Blunt, relying on evidence adduced by the same writer, believes that Melanchthon had a voice in the drawing up of the document."—*Hardwick*, p. 41.

Hardwick, p. 33, tells us that "Henry begged from the princes of the Augsburg Confession to fulfil their former promise and send over a legation of divines (including his peculiar favorite, Melanchthon) to confer in the disputed points with a committee of English theologians. \* \* The Lutheran embassy arrived when a committee was nominated by the King to act as organ of the Church of England. The whole course of the discussion was apparently determined by the plan and order of the *Augsburg Confession*."

Blakeney in the Book of Common Prayer, its History, &c., says, pp. 77, 78: "The similarity of the expressions in our articles to the Augsburg Confession, proves that our reformers agreed with Luther on some points. \* \* Archb. Laurence compares some of our articles with the Augsburg and Wurtemberg Confessions to show that our reformers had these formularies before them and borrowed many of their expressions in the composition of the articles. \* \* We not only admit the

fact but glory in it. No writer has expounded and vindicated the Scripture of Justification more clearly than Luther. The Eleventh Article sets forth his view. The Church of England on this subject is *Lutheran*." \* \*

Bp. Whittingham, of Maryland, in the charge to his clergy, 1849, says "that with the Augsburg Confession their (the Thirty-Nine Articles) connection is of a nature the most intimate and direct, substantiable by superabundant evidence, both internal and circumstantial. In more than one respect the *Augsburg Confession* is the source of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England and America—their prototype in form, their model in doctrine, and the very foundation of many of their expressions; while others are drawn from its derivative expositions and repetitions."

It is not inappropriate to introduce the testimony of another distinguished witness, not of the Church of England.

"The Thirty-Nine Articles were established as the law of the land under Queen Elizabeth, in 1571. \* \* They are based on German Confessions of faith. Very probably the thirteen which were found among Cranmer's papers were the result of Conferences between German and English theologians, begun in Wittenberg, 1533, and continued in London in 1538, who aimed at a union of both Churches. These thirteen closely follow the order of the first seventeen Articles of the Augsburg Confession and are copied nearly word for word."—*Herzog's Encyclop.*, I. ed., vol. I. 325, which see also for the differences between the whole Thirty-Nine Articles and the Augsburg Confession.

Schaff, in *Creeds of Christendom*, I. 623, says:

"The Edwardine Articles were based in part, as already observed, upon a previous draft of Thirteen Articles, which was the joint product of German and English divines, and based upon the doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. Some passages were transferred verbatim from the Lutheran document to the Thirteen Articles, and from these to the Forty-Two (1553), and were retained in the Elizabethan revision (1563 and 1571). This will appear from the following comparison. The corresponding words are printed in *Italics*."

After giving the comparison in parallel columns, Schaff thus concludes :

"Besides these passages, there is a close resemblance in thought, though not in language, in the statements of the doctrine of original sin and of the possibility of falling after justification. Several of the Edwardine Articles \* \* were suggested by Article Seventeen of the Augsburg Confession, which is directed against the Anabaptists."

And finally, one extract from two of our own writers :

"As to the Twenty-Five Articles, which embody the acknowledged doctrines of the Methodist Societies, they are in language and substance, so nearly identical with the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, that they must be traced through them to the same source. They are only remoter issues from the same Lutheran fountain."

"It is, therefore, with justice that the Lutheran Church takes to herself the high appellation of *The Mother of Protestants*."—*Seiss, Eccles. Luth.*, p. 124.

"It requires no very extensive historical apparatus to trace the course of the negotiations which for some years were in progress between Henry VIII. and the members of the Smalcald League. Volumes II. and III. of Melanchthon's Works in the Corpus Reformatorum, volumes IV. and V. of De Wette's Luther's Briefen, and Seckendorf's Historia Lutheranismi afford abundant material.

"From these it appears that according to the Religious Peace of Nurenberg of July 23rd, 1532, subscription to the Augsburg Confession and the Apology was made the condition of enjoying any of the privileges of the League, and that when in 1535, the English King desired to enter it as a member, he was at once informed that an absolute prerequisite was that he should accept these two Confessions of the Lutheran churches.

"At the close of that year, Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford, the ablest of the English theologians of his period, who had been employed by Wolsey in the negotiations with the pope concerning the King's divorce, was sent to Wittenberg with the King's chaplain, Nicholas Heath, afterwards Lord Chancellor of England, and Dr. Barnes, whose position as prior of the Augus-

tinians, and his open devotion to the doctrines of Luther rendered especially popular with the Reformers. After conferences there, a meeting of the League was held at Smalcald, where it was again laid down as the prime condition that the King 'promote the gospel of Christ according to the mode in which the princes and confederate states confessed it in the diet of Augsburg, and defended it according to the published Apology.' From January until April 1536, the English theologians were at Wittenberg in consultation with Luther and his colleagues. During their deliberations, the Augsburg Confession was examined sentence by sentence, and learned dissertations were written on points of difference, in order that if possible a common agreement might be reached. When the English theologians left, they took with them a *Repetitio* of the Augsburg Confession, prepared by Melanchthon. The English Ten Articles of 1536, in the formulation of which Bishop Fox took a prominent part, are found on examination to be taken largely from the Apology, but also incorporate material from the Augsburg Confession, and several treatises written by Melanchthon at that period. The missing *Repetitio* which had been brought from Wittenberg would probably show that that was the groundwork upon which theologians not yet purged of papal errors engrafted many of their vagaries. 'The Institution of a Christian Man,' or Bishop's Book of 1537, is in a number of places only a paraphrase of Luther's catechisms, although it has also drawn upon the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and probably even the Smalcald Articles."—*Prof. H. E. Jacobs, D. D.*

Thus, the Lutheran Origin of the Thirty-Nine Articles has been fully illustrated. Many more extracts from the writings of great divines of the Church of England, might have been given, but they only reiterate and confirm what the earlier writers have said, and it was deemed superfluous to insert them.

## ARTICLE III.

## FENELON.

By REV. H. H. HALL, A. M., Millersburg, Ohio.

Now and then a man escapes oblivion by reason of an attribute in his nature, unusually developed, and which goes by the term goodness. In some quarters this quality is disparaged and even regarded a weakness, but it survives every other human excellence. There have been men in every calling, remarkable in this way, and when they died, the extravagant language was applied to them:

“He made a heaven about him here,  
And took how much with him away.”

It is this that impresses one in the contemplation of the Bishop of Cambray. He was the most amiable and good of all the great prelates in the time of Louis XIV. and his name, now, is the brightest and most enduring, because of his rare virtue and tenderness and love.

Francis de Salignac de la Mothe Fenelon was born at the castle of Fenelon, in Perigord, August 6, 1651. He was descended of an ancient and noble family. At the age of 12 he went to the University of Cahors, and thence to Paris, to complete his studies in philosophy. He next attended the theological school of St. Sulpice, and made such astonishing progress in the most difficult branches, that in his 15th year he preached with great applause.

Early in life he was seized by a desire to devote himself to foreign missions. The missionary calling, with its devotion and hardships, had a mighty fascination for him, because it resembled that of the apostles of old. It completely possessed him. In his day much attention was given to the conversion of Canada and the savages of the New World, and it was to this field he decided to devote himself. How different would have been his fame, destined as he was to high place and influence in an

accomplished age, had he been allowed to follow his impulse, and given himself to a work among the dusky people living in the deserts and forests of America! But, on account of poor health and the opposition of his friends, he gave up that purpose, although preaching the gospel to the heathen had, ever after, for him, a very unusual attraction. He was at once admitted into the most distinguished society, and because of his eloquence and rare charm of manners, rapidly became known to the public. At the age of 24, he took holy orders and entered upon his ministerial duties in the parish of St. Sulpice. He was sent as a missionary to several Protestant districts, and by his mildness and amiability won over many of them and quelled the tumults threatening in those parts. On his return from this mission, Louis made him preceptor to his grandsons, the dukes of Burgundy, Anjou and Berri. In 1694 he was created bishop of Cambray.

In appearance, Fenelon was very remarkable. He was tall, and had the flexibility and grace of Cicero. There was little, or none, of the animal in his physique; he was all spiritual. His bearing, conversation, the contour of his face, with its lines of graciousness, transparent eyes and noble, lofty forehead, were all harmonious and eloquent. To this was added a voice, winning, full and resonant, an originality of thought and manner and a wonderful power to please, without artfulness. Saint-Simon has this appreciative portrait of him. "That prelate was a tall, lean man, well made, pale, with a great nose, eyes from which fire and spirit streamed forth like a torrent, and a physiognomy wholly unlike any other I have ever seen, and which could never be forgotten even if you had seen it but once. All expressions were united in it, and the most dissimilar ones harmonized. It had gravity and courtesy, seriousness and gaiety; it spoke equally of the doctor, the bishop, and the great lord, but the qualities which were most conspicuous in it, as well as in his whole person, were delicacy, wit, gracefulness, propriety, and, above all, nobleness. It required an effort to cease to look at him."

As to character, Fenelon was remarkably well balanced and strong. The spirit of equity possessed him in such a degree

that he would grant no dispensation in the cases of nobles and princes, or, "officers paid by the king," which he refused to the poorest and humblest of his parish. His was a most amiable soul. In his definition of piety, he unconsciously gave much insight into his nature and life. "Piety," he said, "has nothing in it that is weak, or sad, or constrained; it enlarges the heart; it is artless and lovely; it becomes all things to all, to win them all." Somebody has declared: "The disposition of Fenelon had something in it that was sweetness itself, more patient than patience." Nor is this to be understood in the sense of too much compliance, or leniency. He knew all the while, how, without seeming to be exacting, to place his finger upon the essential points and attain them. He stated his preference without offense, but in such unmistakable terms that everybody could understand. He was always cheerful, affable and kind; and, although he had many disappointments, there is no evidence that his troubles soured him, or made him uncharitable. His rare knowledge of the world and of men caused him to cling steadfastly to his friends. He said most beautifully: "True friends make all the sweetness and all the bitterness of life," and wrote to one, of the desirability "of all good friends having an understanding to die together on the same day."

He was preëminently a pastor. The pastoral relation is a very near and intimate one. There have been times in the past when the minister of the gospel was held in awe and even fear. When he visited the home of a parishioner he did it with stern and forbidding aspect, and with an air of having all the responsibilities and sorrows of the world upon his two shoulders at once. Who does not remember, when his approach was like that of a lowering cloud, or some threatening danger? It was a signal for all cheer to depart, and for each member of the household to don a sober look and a most respectful demeanor. Newton says: "A friend of mind in passing a public house in Haworth on a Lord's Day morning saw several persons making their escape out of the lower windows, and some over a low wall; he was first alarmed fearing that the house was on fire, but upon inquiring the cause of the commotion, he was told that they saw the parson coming. They were more afraid of

their parson than of a justice of the peace." The day is gone by when the pastor can hold his place through fear, and dominate the people by virtue of his office. If he has power now, it is because he has hold of the hearts of men and lives in their regard and affection. And no man in the world has the opportunity of endearing himself to the people, which the pastor has. For the old parson who has always done his duty, in trouble and sadness, and has faithfully imparted instruction and help, there is a peculiar respect throughout the community, and the sentiment of Tennyson's line is everybody's:

"A good gray head which all men knew."

Fenelon had such modesty and grace, and, withal, such charity, as fitted him in a remarkable degree for this phase of his calling. He was perfectly adapted to humanity, and ruled by the power of the affections. He wanted to be loved and he loved in return, and in this lay his wonderful charm. The following is an extract from a Memoir of his Life: "In the course of his walks, he would often join the peasants, sit down with them on the grass, talk with them, and console them. He visited them in their cottages, seated himself at table with them, and partook of their humble meals. By such kindness and familiarity, he won their affections, and gained access to their minds. As they loved him as a father and friend, they delighted to listen to his instructions, and to submit to his guidance. Long after his death the old people who had the happiness of seeing him on these occasions, spoke of him with the most tender reverence. 'There,' they would say, 'is the chair on which our good archbishop used to sit in the midst of us; we shall see him no more,' and their tears would flow.

"The diocese of Cambray was often the theatre of war, and experienced the cruel ravages of retreating and conquering armies. But an extraordinary respect was paid to Fenelon by the invaders of France. The English, the Germans, and the Dutch rivalled the inhabitants of Cambray in their veneration for the archbishop. All distinctions of religion and sect, all feelings of hatred and jealousy that divided the nations, seemed to disappear in the presence of Fenelon. Military escorts were

offered him for his personal security, but these he declined, and traversed the countries desolated by war to visit his flock, trusting in the protection of God. In these visits his way was marked by alms and benefactions. While he was among them, the people seemed to enjoy peace in the midst of war.

"He brought together into his palace the wretched inhabitants of the country, whom the war had driven from their homes, and took care of them, and fed them at his own table. Seeing one day that one of these peasants ate nothing, he asked him the reason of his abstinence. 'Alas! my lord,' said the poor man, 'in making my escape from my cottage, I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The enemy will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good.' Fenelon, availing himself of his privilege of safe conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove the cow back himself to the peasant.

"'This,' said Cardinal Maury, 'is perhaps the finest act of Fenelon's life.' He adds, 'Alas! for the man who reads it without being affected.' Another anecdote, showing his tenderness to the poor, is thus related of him. A literary man, whose library was destroyed by fire, has been deservedly admired for saying, 'I should have profited but little by my books, if they had not taught me how to bear the loss of them.' The remark of Fenelon, who lost his in a similar way, is still more simple and touching, 'I would much rather they were burned than the cottage of a poor peasant.'

"The virtues of Fenelon give his history the air of romance; but his name will never die. Transports of joy were heard at Cambray when his ashes were discovered, which it was thought had been scattered by the tempest of the Revolution; and to this moment the Flemings call him 'The Good Archbishop.'"

But it has ever been the lot of good men to have enemies. Envy now sought out Fenelon, and made him the subject of the most violent persecution. And the prolific source of his troubles was the affair of Madame Guyon. This woman was young, beautiful and rich. Having become a widow at the early age of twenty-eight, she gave her three children to the care of others and relinquished herself to "divine impulses," by which is meant,

the renunciation of self and the giving up of all earthly cares and sympathies. Her soul was lifted up into a remarkable ecstasy, by her dreamy nature and ardent imagination, and such was her fervor and eloquence that she made many converts. Prayer, with her, was simply the silence of the soul absorbed in God. "Why are not simple folks so taught?" She said: "Shepherds keeping their flocks would have the spirit of the old anchorites; and laborers, whilst driving the plough, would talk happily with God: all vice would be banished in a little while and the kingdom of God would be realized on earth." Fenelon defined her doctrine of pure love in the following words: "There is an habitual state of love of God which is pure charity without any taint of self-interest. Neither fear of punishment nor desire of reward have any longer part in this love; God is loved not for the merit or the perfection or the happiness to be found in loving him." These ideas had a strange fascination for the nobler minds of that period, and among the adherents of this female mystic, were a number of ladies and their husbands at court. Indeed, some most illustrious personages, then and afterwards, were zealous advocates of her doctrines. Madame Krüdener, the Russian novelist, of remarkable intelligence and great beauty and wit, was a mystic. Sainte-Beuve calls her "the Prophetess of the North." She was the counselor of Alexander of Russia, and possessed a wide and powerful influence. Madame de Staël and her accomplished daughter the Duchess de Broglie were very strongly inclined to this faith. "Who," asks the distinguished mother, "is not profoundly affected in reading the spiritual writings of Fenelon? Where else do we discover more light, more consolation, more charity? Here is no fanaticism, no austerity other than that of virtue, no intolerance, no exclusiveness." At another time she declares: "I believe in Mysticism, that is to say, in the religion of Fenelon, that which has its sanctuary in the heart, which joins love to works." Of the daughter, the American author, Ticknor, wrote: "I have seldom seen any one with deeper and more sincere feelings of tenderness and affection, and never a French woman with stronger religious feelings. And, so, many others might be mentioned

even to Jonathan Edwards, who preached these doctrines in New England.

Now, readiness of mind is always a grand endowment. Napoleon Bonaparte thought that battles were won by the sudden flashing of an idea. He seems to have counted upon such illumination in every great emergency upon the battle field. So, readiness of mind is also a good thing in a matter of faith and Christian doctrine. In the words of Seneca: "As the immortal gods never learnt any virtue though they are endowed with all that is good; so there are some men who have so natural a propensity to what they should follow, that they learn it almost as soon as they hear it." Bossuet saw, immediately, the danger and opposed the rising enthusiasm with vehemence. The outcome of Madame Guyon's teachings is an end of repentance, no further withholding of evil, no need of a Redeemer, and, indeed, no more responsibility for action—a man may do what he likes, his act can no longer be sin because he is absorbed in God. There are others, equally sincere and earnest, who have not this readiness of insight and foresight. They must blunder and learn by sad experience. Fenelon was one of these. Moreover, his was one of those gentle, pious natures to which the doctrines of Madame Guyon were peculiarly adapted. But, while he held to and advocated this mysticism, he did not accept the most extreme points and positions which it included. He refused his approbation of a work of Bossuet, written against Madame Guyon and her teachings, and in the same year himself published a book in which he adopted some of her tenets, especially, that love of God must be pure, disinterested and without hope of reward.

Bossuet was furious, and thoroughly aroused against his old friend and pupil. He now used all his influence to bring about his condemnation, and succeeded. Fenelon was exiled from his diocese and his book was censured. The Pope, however, with the censure, sent back to the prelates who had been so severe, the following rebuke: "He has sinned through excess of love of God, but you have sinned through lack of love for your neighbor." The way in which Fenelon received his condemnation is another grand proof of his true greatness and amiability

of disposition. He was about to ascend his pulpit and address his people upon an important subject, when a brother handed him the information, and, although the blow was severe, no one saw in his face any emotion. He knelt, for a moment, with his face in his hands, so that he might change his subject, and then discoursed upon the entire submission which was owed by all, to those who had authority in the Church. His whole flock suffered with their pastor and many were in tears when they beheld his resignation. And so he showed that his soul was greater even than his genius.

It can hardly be said that Fenelon was ever actuated by ambition. He inclined to a life of privacy and study, and his motto was, "Ama Nesciri"—Love to be unknown. In youth, his favorite retreat was the country house of Bossuet, at Germigny, near Paris, where, with other luminaries of the Church he enjoyed the leisure of that great and eloquent ecclesiastic. But there were circumstances which led him to expect advancement to high place in the government. The most fascinating man in the kingdom because of his rare charm of manners and appearance, remarkably eloquent in discourse, and possessing a genius which rose far above all by whom he was surrounded, he could not help having great admiration and influence. His influence at court rapidly increased. He had the regard and confidence of Madame de Maintenon, who herself ruled the king. Then, his extraordinary success as preceptor to the duke of Burgundy was greatly to his advantage. That young man was impetuous, fiery and indomitable. As a Christian priest, his tutor saw, at once, that religion could triumph over and subdue such a nature as the one with which he had to deal. And he judged rightly. His sympathetic nature wrought itself into the very soul of the young prince, and he became pious, "gentle, complaisant." The demon was cast out of him and he came forth "singularly well-informed, fond of study, with a refined taste in literature, with a passion for science," for which Fenelon received the genuine gratitude of all France. Again, after his exile, he would very naturally desire advancement. Promotion is vindication. Even the Psalmist prayed: "Shew me a token for good; that they which hate me may see it, and be ashamed: because thou,

Lord, hast holpen me, and comforted me." But his aspiration never caused him to wrong a single man, and it may be characterized, in the words of Lamartine, as "that species of ambition which does not seek to aggrandize its possessor, but which is involuntarily created and revealed by intellectual ability." This excellent writer goes on to say: "There are certain men whom nature has endowed with distinct privileges. Their ambition, instead of being the offspring of passion, is the emanation of mental power. They do not aspire, but they mount by an irresistible force, as the aerostatic globe rises above an element heavier than itself, by the sole superiority of specific ascendancy. The very goodness of Fenelon caused him to desire some future elevation, where his benevolent spirit could shed itself with more effect upon all around him."

But he was doomed only to disappointment. The death of the grand-dauphin made his expectation seem near of realization. And the nearer the duke of Burgundy came to the throne, the more watchful and solicitous was Fenelon that he might be prepared to act well his part. He was ever giving him wise counsel and the prince listened to him with reverence and attention. The young duke, however, died, and every hope of the faithful preceptor was gone. Had the duke of Burgundy lived to occupy the throne, Fenelon would have been prime minister and France would have become a Christian republic with a supreme head. Fenelon now wrote: "All my ties are broken. I live but on affection and of affection I shall die; we shall recover ere long that which we have not lost; we approach it every day with rapid strides; yet a little while, and there will be no more cause for tears." And, when a man has been a long while the subject of buffeting and disappointment, he turns at last from the things to which he looked for satisfaction and happiness and finds what he sought elsewhere. Now, it is to others he devotes himself. Human nature robbed of all other source of joy, or motive for living, can find what it needs in a life for mankind. Then it is in himself he discovers what he wants, and is surprised at the almost boundless resources there are within him. Henceforth he is in the world and yet not of the world—he lives a life of contemplation and philosophy.

From both these sources Fenelon derived solace. He lived and worked most earnestly for others, but his experiences taught him to not depend upon men. It is the point, in noble living, to which the grandest and most Christlike have had to attain, which he describes in these words, written to a friend: "You are right in saying and believing that I ask little of men in general; I try to do much for them, and to expect nothing in return. I find a decided advantage in these terms; on these terms I defy them to disappoint me. It is only upon a very small number of true friends that I count, and I do it not from motives of interest, but from pure esteem; not from a desire to derive any advantage from them, but to do them justice in not distrusting their affection. I would like to oblige the whole human race, especially virtuous people; but there is scarcely anybody to whom I would like to be under obligation. Is it through haughtiness and pride that I think thus? Nothing could be more foolish and more unbecoming; but I have learned to know men as I have grown old, and I believe that it is the best way to do without them without pretending to superior wisdom." That, in a very great measure, was the attitude of our divine Saviour, and it is the secret of the dreadful loneliness felt by the best souls that have ever lived in this world.

The favorite ancient work of Fenelon was Horace, which he knew by heart and quoted incessantly. As a writer he had wonderful grace and fascination and elegance. In public address he had rare genius and was universally esteemed for his powers of eloquence. His "musical tones" charmed everybody. He was always original and imparted to all his thoughts such new turn, that he seemed to his hearers to be inspired and master of every science. In conversation, as well as in his discourses, he adapted himself to the man and the hour, and the sweetness of his voice and face and manner caused all to desire to be with and hear him again. The Prince de Signe distinguishes each of the great preachers of the time of Louis XIV. in these words: "Bourdaloue makes me fear everything, Massillon makes me hope everything, Bossuet astonishes me, Fenelon touches me." His characteristics were tenderness and gentleness. He was severe in exposing the corruptness of the

human heart, but he had an eye of pity, and an angel's compassion, as he looked upon the frailties of the race.

A paper on Fenelon would not be complete without at least a few words about the work, which, more than anything else, made him immortal. This book, although written in prose, has been justly styled poetry, and is ranked among the great epics. About its purpose and the time of its production there has been a variety of conjectures. It was written in the studious leisure of its amiable author, and in order to direct the mind and influence the heart of the royal pupil. It has a classic form, but is Christian in spirit and sentiment. Telemachus is the son of Ulysses, and goes in search of his father, who was driven by the gods from his own kingdom, the island of Ithica. While he is upon this quest, he encounters many difficulties and dangers, has numerous temptations and discouragements, but, under the faithful guidance of Wisdom, in the guise of an old man called Mentor, he comes out at last innocent, strong by experience, and an accomplished man and prince. The book is political in character, and, although imperfect in its economy, it was a revelation on some of the most important interests of the human race. Frederick the Great said once: "If I had an empire to punish I would bestow the government of it upon the philosophers." This remark applies in part to Telemachus, and yet the people were taught in it for the first time the fundamental fact of true government, that twenty millions of human beings do not exist for the gratification and glory of one man. Read in our day and with all the light of the nineteenth century, one finds much in it that is common-place, but it startled the age in which it was produced, and at that time had remarkable originality. It discovered new truth. In the words of Macaulay: "We can distinguish in it, if we are not greatly mistaken, the first faint dawn of a long and splendid day of intellectual light, the dim promise of great deliverance, the undeveloped germ of the charter and the code." It had a potent influence. It was followed by disturbance and perhaps even produced the worst evils of the Revolution. But truth is revolutionary. The very gospel of Christ set one man at variance with another and sent the sword into the world. It did its work however. Lam-

artine declares: "The times called for it; the vicissitude of glory and tyranny, the servitude and misfortunes of the nation at the end of the wars of Louis the Fourteenth, had impressed the whole mind of Europe with a sort of presentiment of this book. It contained the vengeance of the people, a lesson to kings, the inauguration of philosophy and religion in politics."

Richer and more beautiful descriptions it is impossible to find anywhere, than those which occur constantly in Telemachus. The pleasures of virtue, the scenes and experiences of pastoral life, are all most charmingly depicted. Here are two passages in illustration of the felicity of ideas and language of Fenelon. The first is from Book II. and presents a picture of Egypt: "If the sorrows of captivity had not rendered us insensible to pleasure, we must have been delighted with the prospect of this fertile country, which had the appearance of a vast garden, watered with an infinite number of canals. Each side of the river was diversified with opulent cities, delightful villas, fields that produce every year a golden harvest, and meadows that were covered with flocks: earth lavished her fruits upon the husbandman, till he stooped under the burden; and Echo seemed pleased to repeat the rustic music of the shepherds."

The second is from Book X., and surely there cannot be anything finer: "Husbandmen are always rich in proportion to the number of their children, if their prince does not make them poor; for the children afford them some assistance, even from their infancy. The youngest can drive the flock to pasture, those that are further advanced can look after the cattle, and those of the third stage can work with their father in the field. In the meantime the girls assist the mother, who prepares a simple but wholesome repast for those that are abroad, when they return home fatigued with the labor of the day. She milks her cows and her ewes; she brings out her little stores, her cheeses, and her chestnuts, with fruits that she has preserved from decay; she piles up the social fire, and the family gathers round it; every countenance brightens with the smile of innocence and peace, and some rural ditty diverts them till the night calls them to rest.

"The shepherd returns with his pipe, and to the assembled family sings some new song that he has learnt at the neighboring village. Those that have been at work in the fields come in with the plough and the weary oxen, that hang down their heads, and move with a slow and heavy pace, notwithstanding the goad, which now urges them in vain. All the sufferings of labor end with the day; the poppies which, at the command of the gods, are scattered over the earth by the hand of sleep, charm away every care; sweet enchantment lulls all nature into peace, and the weary rest, without anticipating the troubles of to-morrow.

"Happy, indeed, are those unambitious, mistrustless, artless people, if the gods vouchsafe them a king that disturbs not their blameless joy! And of what horrid inhumanity are they guilty, who, to gratify pride and ambition, wrest from them the sweet products of the field, which they owe to the liberality of nature and the sweat of their brow! In the fruitful lap of nature there is inexhaustible plenty for temperance and labor: if none were luxurious and idle, none would be wretched and poor."

Fenelon died Jan. 7, 1715, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and it is fitting to conclude with the words of a celebrated writer quoted several times already: "Conscience owes him an additional virtue—toleration; thrones, another duty—the love of the people; republics, an added glory—humanity. France has possessed bolder natures, but she has given us none so full of tenderness. If genius acknowledged a sex, it might be said that Fenelon had the imagination of a woman to dream of heaven, and her soul to love the earth. When we pronounce his name, or open his book, we fancy that we look on his face, and persuade ourselves that we hear the voice of a friend. What quality of fame can surpass this love in veneration and solid value?

"The epitaph of Fenelon might be written in these words: 'There are men who have made France more feared or renowned, but none have rendered her more beloved by other nations.'"

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE "FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES" OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL,

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

It is now about twenty years since the General Council was organized. It came into existence in the midst of heated conflicts and passionate controversy. The time since elapsed has been sufficient for two things. *First*, to permit the feelings of those times to subside into a calmness more favorable to impartial and correct judgment; and *secondly*, to develop and exhibit the actual character of the foundations on which the new organization was formed. This latter result appears particularly in the progress of discussion and action by which the question and practice of pulpit and altar fellowship are reaching settlement and in the recent widely published explanations and defense of "The Fundamental Principles" by the Norton Professor in the Theological Seminary at Philadelphia.

Not at all in the spirit of controversy, but of calm and fitting examination and discussion, it is here proposed to look at some features of these "Fundamental Principles," as these twenty years have served to make known their actual character as a confessional basis. The purpose is not at all to discuss the doctrines of the Lutheran Church, nor our duty as Lutherans to maintain them. This duty is recognized. But assuming a common and true acceptance of the Lutheran doctrines, the question will concern rather the proper ecclesiastical position which true fidelity should take for the best life and work of our Church in this land.

Only two points are to be brought under review. These will be sufficient to show the salient and ruling conceptions by which the organization has fixed and marked its ecclesiastical position, and would, if possible, mark the whole Lutheran Church of our land, and by which we may judge whether that position presents our Church altogether in her proper character and right

attitude. These two points are, *first*, the exclusive relation established towards other parts of the Church of Christ, and *secondly*, the denial of the principle of doctrinal development or modification within our Church. These points must be looked at separately and in their joint significance.

I. The exclusive relation of the Lutheran Church to the rest of the Church catholic, required under the Fundamental Principles. It is assumed in this discussion that this relation may be learned from the interpretation authoritatively given of the Principles since their adoption. This interpretation, even if not the necessary or true one, yet since solemnly adopted and proclaimed, must be taken as actually marking the organization.

In looking at the Fundamental Principles themselves we might not only fail to get the separatistic idea or purpose from them, but innocently take them as setting forth the very opposite. The first Principle reads:

"There must be, and abide through all time, one holy Christian Church, which is the assembly of all believers, among whom the gospel is purely preached and the holy sacraments are administered as the gospel requires.

"To the true unity of the Church it is sufficient that there be agreement touching the doctrine of the gospel, that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the sacraments be administered conformably to God's word."

This is a clear and just statement, drawn from the Augsburg Confession, of the doctrine concerning the Church, in the character in which we say: "We believe in one holy catholic [Christian] Church." This is the Church which Christ loved and for which He gave himself that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water with the word—being not simply the Church invisible, for it is marked as manifested in the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. This Church is conceded to be *one*—"one holy Christian Church," the one body of which Christ is the Head,—I Cor. 12:3, Ep. 1:22, 23. What is sufficient for this unity is distinctly defined: "agreement touching the doctrine of the gospel, that it be preached in one accord, in its pure sense, and that the sacraments be administered conformably to God's word." It will not be questioned that the first of the Fundamental Principles

refers to the Church in this sense, or that in making a distinct article of it the Church catholic is recognized as larger and more inclusive than the Lutheran or any particular Church. It assumes, too, that the whole Church consists of the believers which form the parts found in the particular Churches, and thus lays the basis for finding true *churchly* character in the particular organizations. There is a holy catholic Church, as a precondition for parts of it. This first Principle, therefore, recognizes the Church in that conception in which the doctrine concerning it is fundamental.

The second of the Fundamental Principles then proceeds to define the true unity of a "*particular Church*," not, of course, as outside of, but in, the unity of the "*one holy Christian Church*:"

"The true unity of a particular Church, in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name, is unity in doctrine and faith and in the sacraments, to wit: That she continues to teach and to set forth, and her true members embrace from the heart, and use, the articles of faith and the sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name."

It is to be distinctly observed and borne in mind that the "*particular Church*" is a true part of the "*one holy catholic Church*." For in the next Principle such Churches are expressly put in this relation of consistent and integral parts of the general or universal unity:

"The unity of the Church is witnessed to, and made manifest in, the solemn, public and official Confessions which are set forth, to wit: The generic unity of the Christian Church in the general Creeds, and the specific Unity of pure parts of the Christian Church in their specific Creeds; one chief object of both classes of which Creeds is, that Christians who are in the Unity of faith may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship."

This language clearly recognizes, what is unquestionably true, that the Christian Church is marked both by generic unity and by specific unities, and that the differences between the specific Creeds of the parts do not amount to a nullification of the really Christian and church character of those parts. It acknowledges,

too, that the oneness of the whole Church is to be "*witnessed to*" and "*made manifest*" as truly and distinctly as is the oneness of any part, and is to be neither set aside nor obscured by the existence of the parts. The acceptance of the oecumenical Creeds by the particular Churches is, according to this Principle, their "public and official" profession of unity and union with the "one holy Christian Church." And, according to a conceded principle, these oecumenical Creeds, because of their peculiar and paramount authority, have paramount force for the generic unity for which they stand. For *Hutter* well expresses what may be justly taken as the consensus of our theologians, when he says: "*Those symbols which have been approved by the unanimous consent of the whole Church (to which class belong the three oecumenical symbols) have far greater authority than those which have been received only by particular Churches.*"\* The clear light of this principle forbids us to treat the "specific" witness as everything and the "generic" as nothing, or to intensify the specific into a repudiation of the oecumenical unity or fellowship. These portions of the Fundamental Principles unmistakably recognize the truth that the actual organization of Christendom into its different particular Churches is not to be held as destructive of the Church's generic unity. In asserting the place and right of particular Churches, they do not forget or deny the fundamental oneness in which God's Church is still to be made "*manifest*." On the contrary, they find the legitimacy and right relation of the particular Churches in the fact that they are "*parts*" of the one great divine unity. They mark the parts as parts of the whole, and assume that that which is not a part of the oecumenical Church is not a Christian Church at all.

This unquestionably correct teaching is both emphasized and thrown into still clearer light by the affirmation which the third Principle adds concerning the "object" of Creeds: "*One chief object of both classes of which Creeds [the general and specific] is, that Christians who are in the unity of faith may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship.*" The fulness of this terse affirmation appears under analysis. I. One

\**Compend of Theology*, Art. I., 15.

"chief" object of the Creeds is declared. 2. This object is affirmed of "both" classes of Creeds, of the œcumical no less than of the specific. 3. This object is twofold: *First*, "that Christians who are in the unity of faith may *know each other as such*," *i. e.*, as Christians, in their relation at once to the common faith of the Church and to their specific faith; and *secondly*, that "*Christians may have a visible bond of fellowship*," *i. e.*, not only with a particular Church by the specific Creed, but with the "*one holy Christian Church*" by the œcumical. The normal and true relation of Christians, as here taught, and taught correctly, is in "*visible bond of fellowship*" with the Church catholic as well as with "*a particular Church*." The particular Churches thus *establish* themselves in this bond of unity, and pledge themselves to *maintain* it in proper manifestation.

But it now appears that this obvious sense of these first three of the Fundamental Principles, laying a clear basis for Lutheran fellowship with other parts of the Christian Church, is not the true one of *all the Principles taken together*, or at least, not that which they are construed to mean, and declared, by the General Council, to bind those who accept the ecclesiastical position they set forth. The restrictive principle seems to have been incorporated in other portions of the Principles, in the absolute way in which all the statements of the whole Book of Concord are made confessional as "of necessity pure and scriptural," "in the perfect harmony of one and the same scriptural faith." The "Missourians" and some others saw the sanction which the first three of the Principles furnished for possible "fellowship" with other "particular Churches," involved in this way of joining these churches in the "*one holy catholic Church*" with its wide "*communion of saints*"—or if preferred, *as* "*the communion of saints*"—and fearing the leaven of "*unionism*," recoiled from uniting with the new organization, without more distinct guarantees. Other Synods faltered. The long and painful process of settling the question of Pulpit and Altar Fellowship has shown both the difficulties of the task of fixing the exclusive rule into the requirement of the Fundamental Principles, in the face of the first three of them, and at the same time, the General Council's steadily growing purpose to do so. At its

first meeting (Fort Wayne, 1866) it was "not prepared to endorse" the Iowa Synod's judgment against pulpit and altar fellowship with non-Lutherans, "as the correct logical deduction and application of the negative part of our Confessional Books."<sup>\*</sup> Two years later it affirmed "the principle of discriminating as over against an indiscriminate communion," and the exclusion of "heretics and fundamental errorists."<sup>†</sup> In 1869, it indicated that the "final decision" was not yet made; and the next year at Lancaster, O., it proceeded to define "fundamental errorists" in terms which make them, in substance, those who wilfully and persistently desert in whole or in part the faith as set forth in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church.<sup>‡</sup> At Akron, O., in 1872, it formally adopted "The Rule: *Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only—Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only*," with exceptions in the sphere, not of right, but of privilege, to be determined in consonance with these principles by the conscientious judgment of pastors as cases arise.<sup>§</sup> The statement of this rule was completed at Galesburg, in 1875, by connecting with it the words: "which accord with the word of God and with the Confessions of our Church,"<sup>||</sup> which insertion was, a year later, declared not to make any change in the rule itself as formulated at Akron, but simply to state "the source of the rule," viz., "the word of God and the Confessions of our Church."<sup>¶</sup>

Dr. Krauth's 105 Theses, prepared at the request of the General Council, are the twisted links of the curious reasoning by which this Galesburg Rule has been acceptably shown to be the true, native and original sense of the Council's confessional basis. "The Galesburg Declaration," says Dr. Krauth, "is the natural and proper *outcome* of all the previous tendency and acts of the General Council, beginning with its Fundamental Principles of Faith and Polity."<sup>\*\*</sup> Though the rule has not been made "coercive," it has been adopted and put forth by the Council itself as the true interpretation and real meaning of its confessional basis, and made "educational" for the practice of the Church.

<sup>\*</sup>Minutes, p. 19.      <sup>†</sup>Minutes of 1868, p. 23.      <sup>‡</sup>Minutes, pp. 35, 36.

<sup>§</sup>Minutes, p. 47.      <sup>||</sup>Minutes, p. 17.      <sup>¶</sup>Minutes of 1876, pp. 25-30.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Thesis, 20.

By reiterated interpretation of the sense of its fundamental law, the Council has given it the place and authority of an accepted confessional principle, with earnest calls for conformity of practice to it.

All this obliges us to look upon the General Council as *in fact* established by its Fundamental Principles in this exclusive relation to other Churches. This relation is assumed all through the labored explanation and defense of them by Dr. Jacobs, Norton Professor in the Philadelphia Seminary, in a lengthened series of articles in *The Lutheran* of last year. In his first article, conceiving of the Council's basis under the Galesburg interpretation, and referring to the generic doctrinal unity of the Church catholic, he makes the sweeping assertion that "if there be dissent touching the doctrine of the gospel, the separation has already occurred against which all faithful witnesses of Christ must give their testimony," even to the 'abandoning of the persistent dissentients to their fate.' It is very easy, if this asserted principle be once admitted in its sweeping terms as an absolute rule with respect to dissent from the oecumenical Creeds, afterwards quietly, but without right, to extend the conclusion, as Dr. Jacobs seems to do all through his discussion, to the whole ground sought to be covered by it. But the assertion is only partially true in the relation in which it is so broadly affirmed, the relation of dissent from the consensus of the Christian faith as set forth in the oecumenical Creeds. And when the dissent is only from portions of the *particular Creeds*, it is not only unproved, but demonstrably *untrue*. Two things are strangely disregarded in the assertion and application of such an absolute principle. *First*, that such absolute and extreme testimony, by withdrawal of all fellowship, can have no just place in the interest of the *specific Creeds*, and is misapplied when the dissent is within the allowance of the conceded generic unity of the "one holy Christian Church." The specific witness only covers the ground of the specific differences—the specific differences within the recognized pure or true parts of the Church. The idea of first acknowledging the parts as *within* the generic unity and then witnessing against them as *out of* the

Church, already "separated," to be "left to their fate," is grotesque enough as a specimen of logic, to say nothing of the wrong it does to the brotherhood of believers. *Secondly*, that dissentient interpretations of many features of gospel truth have, in fact, always had place within the Church, that while in essentials unity has been required, in non-essentials there has been liberty. It depends on *what* the "dissent" touches, and what relation it bears to the vital and necessary features of doctrine. The Church has never confounded, as this recent reasoning does, the distinction between allowable diversity in sincere holding of the truth in Jesus and a rejection of fundamentals which becomes heresy and can be permitted to stand only outside of the communion of the Christian Church. The looseness which talks about "dissent touching the doctrine of the gospel" as already a "separation," without defining the relations or extent of the dissent—a feature that runs through and vitiates the whole discussion referred to—can lead to no trustworthy conclusions in this matter. So far from no dissent being allowed, the very relation asserted in Fundamental Principles, I., II. and III. concedes that the entire body of diversities within the "pure parts" must be allowed place in the aggregate Church.

This confounding of the distinction, which needs always to be kept clear, between the scope and force of the unities represented and asserted by the general and special Creeds respectively, marks the whole argumentation of Dr. Jacobs' explanation. Under the principle of exclusive witness, drawn so sweepingly, against what the *ecumenical consensus* puts outside of the Church, the *specific* Creed is hastily applied so as to treat dissent from its peculiar points as also putting the dissentients outside of the Church—outside, not of the particular Church alone, but of the one holy Christian Church, which measures the true scope of "the communion of saints." Despite the fact that the Principle affirms that "one object of *both* classes of creeds is that Christians who are in the unity of faith *may know each other as such, and may have a visible bond of fellowship,*" the interpretation established by the Council and defended by Dr. Jacobs, makes required testimony against other "parts" practically wipe out or forbid recognition of the "visible bond of fellowship."

This "one chief object" of the ecumenical Creeds is no sooner affirmed than it is excluded from actual force or visible manifestation, and a law of "no-fellowship" is put in its place.

It is this inexcusable confounding of the unity of a particular Church, in its narrow and subordinate place, with the divine unity of the whole Christian Church, and the consequent treating of denominational differences as fundamental heresy, that is illustrated in the glaring perversion and wrong of invoking Gal. 1 : 6-9 in justification of the rigid and intolerant exclusion of fellowship between the different "parts" of the Church of Christ. One gets weary of seeing this and parallel texts made to do forced service in a relation in which they have no applicability. They do, indeed, sustain a principle of "discriminating" over against "indiscriminate" fellowship, excluding what is in fact fundamental heresy; but until it be shown that the erroneous teaching is such that it preaches "another gospel, which is not another," *i. e.*, teaching which subverts the doctrine of salvation by grace, 'overthrowing,' as Luther says, 'the gospel of Christ,'\* the passages must be held to be utterly inadequate to establish this extreme sectarian exclusiveness, or rule of non-fellowship between the great historic Churches of recognized orthodox Protestantism.

But without inquiring further how the Galesburg Rule came to be established, accepted and defended as the logical and necessary outcome of the General Council's Principles of Faith and Polity, it is enough that in fact it has been so established. The Council has framed its confessional basis into a rule of disallowing pulpit and altar fellowship with non-Lutheran Churches. The rule has been affirmed as a "confessional principle."† This fact has been thus recalled, in the connections of its development, in order to invite attention to what it involves. By inexorable logic, two things are inevitable.

1. That the position of the General Council involves a *contradiction* to what its own leading Principles set forth, the existence of "pure parts" of the "one holy Christian Church" in

\*On Gal. 1 : 7.

†Minutes of Council at Akron, pp. 46, 47. Dr. Krauth's *Theses*, 21.

**§24**    *The Fundamental Principles of the General Council.* [Oct.

unity with which it asserts for the Lutheran Church a place. It distinctly assumes that there *are* other parts, and positively asserts for our Church the place of one part. The fifth Principle designates the Evangelical Lutheran Church as "a portion of the holy Christian Church." The "parts" mentioned are, of course, not to be viewed as simply imaginary, but as veritable facts in the actual organization of Christendom. Yet in spite of the confession of particular Churches, as real parts having their right relation in the true visible bond of ecumenical unity, the Council's Principles, *as interpreted by itself*, require it to refuse open recognition of the divine reality. It establishes the unity only to turn round and disown it or refuse it any legitimate manifestation. The entire manifestation allowed in the actual relation must be made to consist in repudiating any condemnatory testimony. For, let the facts in the case be distinctly understood and measured. In the forty-eighth of the 105 Theses on the Galesburg Rule, Dr. Krauth well says: "There are *three* general ways in which the sense of unity in the Church can be *officially expressed*. *One* is by profession of the same Creed, the *second* by admission to public teaching, the *third* is by reception at the altar." In the position assumed by the General Council *all these three* ways of official expression of oneness,—by Confession, by admission to pulpit, and by admission to altar—are turned in declaration of rejection, separation and exclusion. For, the fraction of recognition in the one way, through the generic part of the creed confession, is thoroughly annulled in the emphasis and ruling force given to specific and divisive testimony. Instead of permitting the generic testimony, as by conceded right it ought, to establish and maintain a "visible bond of fellowship," confessionalism is made supreme for wiping out all visible fellowship. The method "by creed" is used so as to show effect only in the specific and divisive side, and to turn the other two ways of testimony into testimony of division and non-recognition. The General Council has thus evidently included conflicting fundamental principles in its basis. After beginning with the truth of the unity of the "one holy Christian Church," witnessed to through acceptance of the general Creeds, in order that "Christians" might know each other, and have a "visible bond of fel-

lowship," in it at once, while asserting for the Lutheran Church the place of one of the "pure parts" of the Church, adds the rule of disallowing that fellowship through all the ways in which it may be officially expressed.

2. That the General Council's principle of exclusion of fellowship with other parts of the Church practically *asserts for the Lutheran Church the attitude and character of a schism*—a schism by self-exclusion from communion with the Church catholic. It withdraws from that which it interprets and confesses to be "the communion of saints." For this "communion of saints" stands identified with, or fulfilled in, the "generic unity." It is unquestionably commensurate with the "holy Christian Church." To establish a separate exclusive communion is withdrawal from that generic unity and communion. The unity or oneness of the Christian Church, of course, does not cease to exist because its communion is ignored, and the only result can be that our Church, if this scheme be accepted, must take the attitude of a schism. What makes it worse is that the rent is made right at the altar of the Church's sacramental unity: "*For we are one bread and one body,*" 1 Cor. 10:17.

There can be no evading of this conclusion. And the question comes up right here: Is this the proper and best ground for our Lutheran Church in this country to assume? Rather, we must ask, can it be *right* or without sin, thus to enact or endorse schism in "the body of Christ?" Is it right or consistent, to confess solemnly the "one holy Christian Church" and affirm our relation as an integral part of it, continually repeating the acknowledgment and claim in our Churches through the use of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, and at the same time insist on refusing to hold or allow fellowship with it in the divinely appointed forms of word and sacraments? Is it the true and best position, by such disruption of fellowship with the rest of the Church in both the word and sacraments, or in the pulpit and at the altar, to discard for our Church all manifestation of living oneness with it and take the character of schismatic separatism? Are we prepared for such a declaration of independence and isolation of our Church from the whole brotherhood of believers? Are we ready for this decree of visible separation? Is it

justifiable, or the best manifestation of the true and required spirit of Christian fraternity, to deny fellowship with other "particular Churches" though confessing agreement in most of the great doctrines of redemption and grace—all the essentials of the saving gospel—by acceptance of which these Churches are acknowledged by us all as Churches of Christ, but on the basis of the diversity of view on a few doctrines, however important we may esteem them or however intense may be our "convictions" of the correctness of our view of them, to deny the sacred fellowship of the Church or disrupt the relation of divinely established unity of the parts? Is this the best way to promote or exhibit the oneness of the Church—the obligation to do which the Holy Spirit seems to be now more strongly than ever impressing on the heart of Christendom? If the crisis of the Reformation, in its violent doctrinal controversies and strifes, threw the particular Churches into inter-relation of non-communion in pulpit and altar, that extreme antagonism, even if counted excusable under the circumstances, need not be perpetuated forever to the discredit of Christian brotherhood and injury to the cause of Christ.

Most, if not all of us in the General Synod, and many, we doubt not, in the General Council, do not believe that this extreme breach of fellowship ought to be permanent or that this intolerant, exclusive position is the right or the best for our great and growing Lutheran Church to take in this age and this land. And we believe this with an intensity and sincerity of "conviction" that is as much entitled to respect as are the "convictions" which are offered as necessitating the rule of the Council. The more we love the doctrines of our Church, the mother Church of the Reformation, with right to stand as the very heart of Christendom, the more unwilling are we to have it hold an attitude so in conflict with the true œcumical communion of saints. It is gratifying to be able to recall the fact that in the mind of the great patriarch of our Church in this land, fidelity to its Confession required no such exclusivism as the Council's Rule. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, laying the foundations of Lutheran organization and practice in our country, laid them in a truer and sweeter catholicity and breadth of

Christian fellowship, as is abundantly evident from the *Hallische Nachrichten*, and distinctly acknowledged in the recent biography by Dr. W. J. Mann.\* Dr. Mann's book has put beyond further dispute the fact of Mühlenberg's fraternal relations and pulpit fellowship with ministers of other denominations. This exclusive and separatistic feature of the Council's organization does not commend to us its Fundamental Principles. Though extolled in glowing phrase as the true basis for union of all Lutherans—with recent signs of irritation that their excellence or perfection should be at all questioned—their reception is found to involve meanings and consequences which our Church in this land must hesitate long before accepting. Rather, we should say, we ought unhesitatingly to refuse to accept such a basis for our Church. We long for a better union and harmony of our Church in this country, but if that union is possible only on this intolerant separatistic position, we are content that it should remain a bright dream unrealized.

II. The second point to which attention is to be called, is that the Fundamental Principles seek to place the Lutheran Church in false relation to the principle and law of doctrinal development which belongs to the "one holy Christian Church."

The Form of Concord itself presents the true conception and force of Confessions:

"We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament. Other writings of ancient or modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them, *and should not be received other or further than as witnesses in what manner and at what place, since the time of the apostles, the [purer] doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved.* \* \* The Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule and standard, according to which, as the only test-stone, all dogmas should and must be discerned and judged, as to whether they be good or evil, right or wrong. But the other symbols and writings cited are not judges as are the Holy

\**The Life and Times of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg*, pp. 388-393, 406, 463.

*Scriptures, but only a witness and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained in the articles in controversy in the Church of God by those who then lived."\**

The specific points in this clearly are, 1. That the Holy Scriptures alone and always are the rule and standard by which all dogmas must be discerned and judged. 2. That all Creeds are but human statements of the way in which the Church, either œcumenical or particular, *understands and accepts* the teaching or truth of God's word. 3. That the symbols belong to place, time or age, according as the Church, under the help of the Holy Spirit and the fuller experience of the truth, may be enabled to hold it fast as previously confessed or put it into fuller and more accurate expression. 4. That Confessions, as formal statements "how, at any time or place, the Holy Scriptures have been understood and explained," are *not*, as to their form, of *unchangeable* permanence, so as forever to exclude modifications or additions which shall express a more accurate or fuller understanding by the Church. The right, if not the duty, of the Church is distinctly and unmistakably implied, to hold its confessional statements subject to whatever modifications the Holy Scriptures may require according to the Church's growing understanding and experience of the gospel.

Let it be distinctly understood here, that the writer does not believe our Confession now needs any change. Under attained exegesis of the word he believes it does not. But he is concerned here with a great principle of both dogmatic and confessional theology. The statements quoted from the Form of Concord concededly present the correct teaching of our Church on this point. But if this teaching be the true Lutheran view, it will become evident, we believe, that the view sought to be made law by the Fundamental Principles of the General Council is not Lutheran—nor Protestant.

It is conceded by all that while the truths of Christianity were given in their completeness in the Holy Scriptures, the Church's apprehension of them has been gradual and progressive through the Christian centuries. All the great doctrines of the gospel

---

\*Dr. Jacobs' Translation, Int. I. and III.

have been developed step by step, in more accurate and fuller form. There have been revision, modification, completer and more precise statement, both of the separate truths and of their relation to each other. This has been so marked a feature of Christian theology that no one can question it. The whole history of doctrine is an illustration and proof of it.

Equally unquestionable is it that Luther and his co-laborers recognized this principle of development and treated all other writings than the Scriptures as subject to the rectification and expansion called for by the word of God. Luther held fast to the old ecumenical Creeds because he saw they expressed the true doctrine of the divine word, but where the decrees of popes, councils, or of the Church in any way, were in conflict with the Scriptures or fell short of their teaching, they were unhesitatingly set aside or amended. Nothing was to have final or unchangeable authority but the word of God. The whole Reformation and Protestantism came by the application of this principle. The Lutheran Confessions themselves are a result and proof of it. They have their existence and legitimacy by it. For it Luther was ready to go to prison or stake. On no other principle could the Lutheran Church ever have obtained "distinctive being" or right to represent a true reformation of genuine Christianity out of the inspired Scriptures, and in conformity to the simple early creeds. We are not at liberty to take the formulated results alone of the Reformation, and discard the principle in and under which they were reached and set forth. That is the old blunder of sawing off the limb on which we are sitting. If there is one principle which the great work of God in the 16th century enthroned as duty for the Church, it is the obligation to hold its confessional statements amenable to the correcting and developing light of God's word, under the Church's continued examination and experience of its divine meaning and power. The theologians of the Form of Concord themselves assumed this principle of development and rested the legitimacy of their own work on it. That it is a valid and vital one for the "one holy Christian Church" on earth, even to

the end is, indeed, indisputable, and need not be further vindicated.

That this law of development of doctrine and amenability of creed statements to the demands of the Scriptures, in the Church's growing understanding of them belongs also to the "true parts" or "particular Churches," is clear from the living indissoluble relation between them. Each of the true parts carries the true attributes of the whole. Happily we need not go far for authorities which will not be questioned in this connection. Quotations from several will be enough.

Müller, in his historico-theological introduction to the *Symbolical Books*, after maintaining the authority of church symbols, proceeds to define the sense and limitations of this authority, evidently in relation to both general and specific creeds :

"Yet she [the Church] ascribes eternal [ewige] authority not to these, but to the word of God alone. \* \* And Luther himself says in reference to the Augsburg Confession, 'We shall hold on to it, until the Holy Ghost shall give us a better one.' The Church then does not wish to ascribe to her symbols immutable authority ; she admits that some one might discover a defect in them ; she finds them merely a temporary expression of her faith ; she reserves to herself expressly the privilege of improving them, of completing, or of extending, as occasional necessity may require."\*

On the subject of confessional modification so as to obtain a final union of the great Protestant Churches, Müller adds :

"We confess that any one bears the Christian name unmerited, who does not at this day from the bottom of his heart desire this true internal union of the separate Confessions ; indeed we are convinced from John 10 : 16 that the Lord in due time will bring about this desirable union in the Church. But He only can effect it."

Dr. Jacobs, in the second volume, of his recently published edition of the *Book of Concord*, has inserted an extract from Dr. G. L. Plitt's *Introduction to the Augustana on The Principle of Confessional Development*. Dr. Plitt was one of the staunchest defenders of strict confessional Lutheranism. He presents the general principle of development and treats it as applicable to

\*New Market Translation, p. 16.

all Church confessions. We quote at length, italicising for the purpose of calling attention to the salient ideas :

"A doctrine of the Church is the result of the Church's consideration of her own nature, *i. e.*, of the communion of man with God which is realized in her, and which by her service is being fulfilled to an always increasing extent. It is the facts of her experience of salvation which the Church, so far as she has become acquainted with them, brings into expression. In making the limitation 'so far as she has become acquainted with them,' we thereby declare that this doctrine of the Church, does not, in its entire extent, originate all at once. The Church is immediately certain of her salvation, which is decided in the person of Jesus Christ, her living Head. But Jesus Christ is an historical person, the goal of a series of facts of salvation tending toward Himself, and the beginning of another series arising with Himself. It is this rich diversity included in that living unity which should become the subject of the Church's knowledge, and which she should clothe in expressions designating its true nature. \* \*

"The knowledge of these manifold facts is only very gradually attained. \* \* The particular agents of this work of attaining knowledge are persons standing in the faith of the Church and constrained by God's Spirit, as God generally effects all progress in church history through persons filled with the Spirit. \* \* Moreover, since the Church is no longer at the beginning of her development and of her activity in the framing of dogmas, these agents will enter into close connection with the past of the Church, and, appropriating what the Church has received from the labor of the fathers as a permanent possession of knowledge, will make still further inquiry. \* \* The results of this new inquiry, produced by the same Spirit, will connect themselves in a homogeneous manner with those which precede, in every case carrying them towards completion, and perhaps correcting them. They fulfill this office of completing when they are occupied with a new and hitherto not yet especially cultivated object of knowledge, or when in them an earlier work is again taken up which at that time, for some reason or other, did not come to a satisfactory conclusion. In the latter case the further development may be a necessary correction of the earlier. \* \* \*

"As much as the fact should be emphasized that the Confessions originate under the guidance of the divine Spirit, yet it must never be forgotten that, since they were composed by men, they must be imperfect, and therefore not only capable of, but need

*development and improvement.* \* \* In the Church, as long as it struggles in the flesh, there is still sin, and even its most spiritual members, the foremost soldiers of the times, who direct the framing of Confessions, are not free from this disease. Their knowledge, as also that of the Church, is always somewhat clouded by sin, and therefore they not only remain imperfect, but may even be infected with error. *Application of this is to be made also to the symbols.*

*"At all events, the position stands firm that no symbol, even though it were up to the present time the most perfect, has an unlimited validity.*

Thus writes this earnest Lutheran, in words so sound and important that they are deemed entitled to a place in this companion volume of *The Book of Concord.*\* They well express the fully established consensus of theology on the subject. The only wonder is that Dr. Jacobs was able, despite the incongruity, to publish them in the same volume with the Council's Fundamental Principles. The distinct points of their teaching are:

1. That the principle of doctrinal and dogmatic development, by a growing knowledge of the completed word of God, *belongs, as a vital principle, to the "holy Christian Church."*
2. That the Church's Confessions are to be made to give expression to this ever completing progress in the truth, made possible by God's providence and Spirit in the experiences and history of the Church.
3. That this development is in the way both of *correction of earlier confessional statement, and of carrying preceding imperfect statements toward completion.*
4. That since all confessions are "*composed by men, they must be imperfect, and therefore not only capable of, but need development and improvement.*"
5. That "*the position stands firm that no symbol, even though it were up to the present time the most perfect, has unlimited validity.*"
6. That it is the Church's duty, marking its living fidelity to Christ, to *keep its confessions always in harmony with its attained understanding of the fundamental truths of the divine word.*

Compare, now, with this unquestionable, great principle of

---

\*pp. 312-319.

development and the right place and force of Creeds, the position in which the Fundamental Principles of the Council would put our Church. We quote the Principles :

II. "The true unity of a particular Church, in virtue of which men are truly members of one and the same Church, *and by which any Church abides in real identity, and is entitled to a continuation of her name,* is unity in doctrine and faith and in the sacraments, to wit: That *she continues to teach and to set forth, and that her true members embrace from the heart, and use, the sacraments as they were held and administered when the Church came into distinctive being and received a distinctive name.*"

IV. "That confessions may be such a testimony of unity and bond of union, *they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine in their own true, native, original and only sense.* Those who set them forth and subscribe them *must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense.*"

V. "The unity of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as a portion of the holy Christian Church, depends upon *her abiding in one and the same faith, in confessing which she obtained her distinctive being and name, her political recognition, and her history.*"

When put together these several affirmations unquestionably construct the following aggregate law :

1. That a "particular Church" can maintain its unity and identity and right to its name *only by continuing to hold and teach in every respect precisely as it did at first.*
2. That this sameness of required teaching must cover "*every statement of doctrine.*"
3. That, as between those who "set forth" the symbols and those who "subscribe" them, there must be agreement to use and understand "*the same words in one and the same sense.*"
4. That this "sense" must be the "native" and "original" sense, "*when the Church came into distinctive being.*"

The logic by which the Fundamental Principles reach this extreme and astonishing position, in complete violation of the established principle of development and the place and authority of confessions, is not distinctly indicated. They seem, however, to rest the conclusion, somehow or other, on the principle of "*identity,*" which is plausibly invoked; and both Dr. Krauth in his *Conservative Reformation*, and Dr. Jacobs in his defence of the

"Principles"\*\* appear to assume this as putting such conclusion beyond question. The used of the principle of identity here has indeed a plausible look; but the plausibility falls far short of conclusiveness the moment it is tested. For, what is "identity?" In what does it consist? Every one knows that the term has different significations and force according as it is applied to different subjects. Identity may be affirmed of persons, or of things, or of general conceptions or logical concepts. When applied to *concepts*, the products of our thought-power, formed of a single attribute or as a generalized complex of attributes, the law of identity permits no change. The concept loses its identity if a single attribute be withdrawn or added. When affirmed of *living things*, however, as a tree or animal, where the sameness consists simply in the continuity of the life and organization, some change in growth and form is consistent with continued identity. But in still greater measure is this the case, when identity is asserted of *persons*. Personal identity persists completely through all changes of view and character. A man may modify his convictions, alter his beliefs, change his character, undergo a thorough revolution in judgment, feeling and life, and yet remain the same man. His identity abides forever in his intelligent, self-directive personality. The continuity of the Church, consisting of believers united with Christ in the word and sacraments, follows the law of personal identity. It has its movement and character in the sphere of intelligent freedom. Its identity is that of collective personality, not of concepts or things. Under self-regulating liberty, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, it may advance in knowledge, correct errors, and modify or advance its confessions in increasing conformity to the divine word. This is the sphere which God has assigned to the Church's intelligence and duty. To assume that it forfeits its identity by doing this, would make its task or duty impossible. Neither the name "Christian" nor "Lutheran," can vacate this principle. It was with this progress of confessional development before it, that the Church assumed the name Christian. It was under this law that the main continuity of the

\* *The Lutheran*, April 22, 1886.

Christian Church as revived in the Reformation, was made bearer of the name Lutheran. It is only sophistry that can claim that a particular Church, by the merely incidental feature of a name, which forms no part of its substantial character, and which may have been affixed to it by its enemies, is excluded from this law of development and fidelity in which God has set the intelligence and will of his whole Church to its true mission and action.

But without inquiring further as to the reasons which led the framers of the Fundamental Principles to cut off, in this absolute way, the Lutheran Church, and all "particular Churches," from the right of theological and confessional development, and restrict it and them irrevocably and forever to the "same words" in the "same sense," unmodified, in which it first uttered its understanding of the word of God, we wish the full import of such position to be looked at:

*First*, that the position of the Fundamental Principles is in contradiction of the well established Lutheran view as to the authority, place and force of Church Confessions, and at variance with the whole Protestant principle on the subject.

*Secondly*, that in this exclusion of the law of development or possible modification, the Fundamental Principles deny to the Lutheran Church the action of one of the forever characterizing principles and marks of the "one holy Christian Church."

*Thirdly*, that such denial to it of the right of sharing in the action of this principle, removing from it one of the attributes of the true Christian Church, instead of giving it its place clearly as a "portion of the one holy catholic Church," so far again makes it take the attitude of difference, separation, and schism. Its effect is to make our Church refuse this great feature of living unity with the true Church of Christ.

Now we may well ask whether in this respect the General Council has set forth the true basis upon which to place our Church in this land and this age, preparing it for its great mission and work in the future. Let it be here repeated, that no assertion of error is made against the Confession. We are distinctly assuming that it is our real confession, expressing our deepest convictions of the teaching of the inspired word. Still,

is it wise or right to put our Church on a basis so false in itself, and which separates it from the law and life belonging to the Church catholic? Even should it never, to the end of time, need to use the freedom of this principle of development, we would not have it renounce its *right* to share in its gains, nor antagonize itself to the clear law of the true Church's life and progress. A confessional basis, such as is sought by a particular Church, need not, of course, make any express provision for the action of the principle of development. But the wrong in this case is its distinct *exclusion*, and that this exclusion is put among "*fundamental principles*." On the simple, yet erroneous assumption that no more light is *ever*, after the development wrought by the theologians of the Form of Concord in 1577, to break forth from the word of God, under the sanctified studies, experience, and divine guidance of the Church century after century, the framers of these "Principles" have undertaken to declare that the Lutheran Church must exempt itself from submission to this law, and divest itself of this characteristic or attribute of the true Church which is to progress in its mission "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God."\* The exclusion is inserted in the face of the teaching of our own theologians, and in contradiction of the principle asserted by Luther himself both for his own guidance and for the guidance of the Church which he was providentially reforming and restoring to its right relation to the word of God.

But this is not all. To see the full teachings of the Fundamental Principles in these two aspects, they must be looked at not simply in their separate force, *but also in the bearing of their joint action*. It is in what their combination means, that we can best test their soundness as a proposed basis for our Church.

The divided and discordant state of the Church of Christ is certainly to be deplored. The mingling of human passion in the past controversies in which men have earnestly contended for the faith, has left its marks in separations and antagonisms intensified beyond the necessities of pure and loving fidelity to the truth. The Church's condition of broken fellowship is not

---

\*Ep. 4 : 13. Revised Version.

only unseemly before the world, but a distinct failure in the divinely required 'meekness' in which believers are besought to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," Eph. 4 : 2. But the intolerant spirit of other times is disappearing. The conviction among the members of the great historic branches of the Protestant Church of their real oneness in Christ is growing into the further conviction that this oneness ought to be better manifested. The attraction of real brotherhood is felt. The dividing differences are beginning to be less in comparison with the grandeur of our "common faith" and "common salvation." It is felt that the reproach of the order of things must be wiped away which implies that after eighteen centuries believers have not yet reached a consensus as to what true Christianity *is*, sufficient for its own appointed fellowship. The "specific unities" are beginning to show sign of recognizing also the broader œcumenic unity. The calmer, more loving temper, unhindered by violent controversies, has contributed somewhat to this. The study of comparative symbolics, revealing the vast consensus of doctrine, has contributed something. The grand coöperative work of the evangelical Churches, united often in labors of reform, mercy and benevolence, in services of prayer and thanksgiving, bringing believers together where the common Christian heart is felt to be beating, has added its influence. But the very development of doctrine, at the roots of which the Council would lay its axe, has been helping the movement to both unity and union. Among the Reformed Churches the harsher edges of Calvinism are disappearing, and if they are not removed from their Confessions, they are being gradually modified in their systematic and applied theologies. Some Churches are modifying the bearings of their creeds by further defining explanations. Only in the last number of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY there was an article exhibiting the approaches to Lutheran views of one of the most prominent teachers of a sister Church. It is just through these agencies of coöperative Christian work and closer Christian fellowship, and the outbreaking light from the word of God in the development of doctrine, that the greater unity in the faith is to come.

But the so-called Fundamental Principles on which the General Council asks the Lutheran Church to place itself, proposes to put all this under arrest. They break, or hold as broken, the fellowship between the "particular Churches." For, it is to be borne in mind, that it is not only the Lutheran Church that is to exclude the wider fellowship in pulpit and at altar. The principle of exclusivism in conscientious testimony against what is held to be erroneous views of the doctrines of the gospel, asserted for the Lutheran Church, being declared to be the rule "which accords with the word of God," is thus declared to be the true one also for the *other* "particular Churches."<sup>\*</sup> Thus the setting up of exclusive altar against altar is to pass into fundamental principle for all, and complete the unhappy separations of the Christian Church. And here comes in the joint action of the second feature of the Council's law. This—the positive exclusion of confessional modification—asserted for the Lutheran Church, is also set forth as a general principle. It is affirmed as the law of identity of "a particular Church"—*every* particular Church—that it abide in its original confessional statement, in the native sense, as when the Church attained distinctive being and name. *No* Church is to have the right to grow toward unity with any other, or harmonize its Confession toward a common understanding of the word. *All* confessional development in all the component "parts" of the Church of Christ is excluded. None is possible by formal change of Confession—for to do so is to lose identity and forfeit name. None can come by indirection, through gradual, silent, unconfessed change of view by ministers and people—for the "members are to embrace from the heart and use the articles of faith" in the "original sense." Even in the Church catholic, all further development of *doctrine* is shut off, except by *fresh schisms and new sects*. The present "particular Churches" can teach, forever, only precisely as their Confessions now say—or die. Unity and union can come only by the dissolution of all the present Churches, *except one*—whose *present* Confession the Church of the future must accept in its native, original sense. And the united action of the two

\*Dr. Krauth's Theses on the Galesburg Rule, 49, 60.

rules must thus mean, that the present broken fellowship of the Church, the existing separatistic communions, with pulpit testifying against pulpit, and altar antagonizing altar, disowning the ecumenical "communion of saints," must be made perpetual, or continued till, in the victory of one particular Church, the rest shall cease to exist. All this, because, according to the General Council, by the fundamental law of the existence of the particular Churches, they are solemnly mortgaged to isolated communion and unchangeable Confession.

Dr. Krauth has well said: "The New Testament idea does not tolerate 'particular Churches' in the sense of distinct and hostile denominations, separate communions, struggling for the same ground, Churches with clashing faiths."\* Surely these "Fundamental Principles" which endeavor to have these "particular Churches" stand toward each other in unrecognizing attitude, testifying against each other in all the three ways of official expression in the case, by specific creed, by exclusion from pulpit and by exclusion from altar, and adopt a law of changeless permanency in these mutually repudiating forms of faith, represent the very perfection of sectarianism. It seems to us that the establishment of such principles would be the erection of the strongest possible barriers against the prayer of the Saviour: "That they may be one—that the world may know that Thou hast sent me." But that prayer has the force of a prophecy, which shall be fulfilled, and the prophecy, we are glad to believe, stands in the way of the real authentication of any such principles.

We are often told: "We are *Lutherans*—let us *be Lutherans*." Yes, certainly. But let us not mistake for Lutheranism anything merely incidental, perhaps an excrescence connected with its outward organization and practice from the antagonisms of the past, temporary and local, and not at all a part of its substantial faith and Christian life. And let us not renounce the great divine principle of practical amenability of creeds to the revising light of God's word, in and on which our Church legitimately came into distinctive being, in the unity and fellowship of the

---

\**Theses*, 86.

true universal Church of God. Let us not diminish our Church into a narrow, intolerant sect, into which others can come only by acceptance of extreme separatism. But let us make our Church what Luther and his co-reformers meant it to be, the revived, purified, true Church of Christ—into which the followers of Christ may come unhindered by any necessity of restriction and sectarian spirit, unhindered, indeed, by anything but want of true, pure Christianity. In this conception and character, the Lutheran Church, with its most catholic of all the Protestant Confessions, may take the position and order of progress in which, as it is the delight of so many of us to represent it, its truly scriptural system of doctrine may stand for the coming consensus of the Christian faith, and attract and unite the dissentient elements of evangelical Christendom.

ERRATA.—On p. 524, 14th line, for “any” read *and*. On p. 525, 1st line, omit “in.” On p. 534, 2nd line, for “used” read *use*.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN ARTIST.

By REV. ALLEN TRAVER, A. M., Rochester, N. Y.

I deem it sufficiently exact to say that by the term Christian I mean a rational being, who has in his unseen and thinking nature, spiritual convictions, spiritual affections, and spiritual aspirations, in the sense revealed in the New Testament, as that is expounded by accredited teachers.

By the word Artist, in connection with the one defined, I mean a man with a cunning hand, directed and moved to its essential tasks, with a fertile brain and propelled by the motives of a humanized and a spiritualized heart, in which the love of God dwells, as well as the love of man; and in which dwell faith, hope, charity; one who amid daily toils finds pleasure in the contemplation of the infinite, and who loves the true, the beautiful and the good.

In that very interesting and profitable book, “Ben-Hur; a tale of the Christ,” Balthasar, the Egyptian, is represented as raising

his eyes most devoutly and reverently, and saying these words, which we regard as pure gold :

"There is a kingdom on the earth, though it is not of it—a kingdom of wider bounds than the earth—wider than the sea and the earth, though they were rolled together as finest gold and spread by the beating of hammers.

"Its existence is a fact as our hearts are facts ; and we journey through it from birth to death without seeing it ; nor shall any man see it until he hath first known his own soul; for the kingdom is not for him, but for his soul. And in its dominion there is glory such as hath not entered imagination—original, incomparable, impossible of increase."

This kingdom is wider than any that the sun in his meridian splendor ever shone upon. It is one of Principle and of Truth, rather than of a material nature and form. There are a few principles, or essential truths, entering into this empire, which are radical and are the subject of more or less discussion in all lands on which the sun shines or are watered by the dews from heaven. These are the doctrine of a soul in every human body; the alienation of that soul from the Being who made it; and the immortality of that soul, in good or evil. On the other side, there is the doctrine of one God ; that he is infinitely holy, pure and just, and that the Christ is the only mediator between God and man. All who are members of this spiritual kingdom in spirit and in life, and are seeking in some or many ways to advance its interests and secure its reception in our natures, may be designated most truthfully as Christian Artists.

In analyzing this subject, that we may see its beautiful order and glory, and that we may learn to think God's thoughts after him, we find a number of elements that enter into every achievement of an artistic nature.

- I. God is the grand, original, creative artist.
- II. Man is a secondary artist, forming conceptions and ideals more or less in harmony with the divine ideals after which he should work.
- III. The materials on which the Christian artist works.
- IV. The arrangement, the method or the order, and the plan of work.

We call the works of God, created by his infinite power and sustained by his goodness, nature. Nature is the thought of God in crystallized forms. Every created object that is beautiful, true, and good, was made after an idea or an ideal, and a thought in the divine mind. Symbols of future perfection and splendor are in these ideas. God is the author of all truth, beauty, and goodness. He reveals goodness through the promptings of the conscience; truth to the intellect, and beauty to the aesthetic nature. And as a man becomes a saint in proportion as he receives the revelation of moral and religious truth, which purifies his motives, changes his unholy and carnal disposition to the love of God and the good, and renders his conscience keenly alive and active, and causes him in a measure to illustrate, in his life, the life of the perfect man; as he becomes a philosopher in the measure in which he receives truth in the intellect and reason, and produces it on a larger scale, from new combinations; and uses it in unfolding the orders and systems that are in nature, and only partially revealed; so also he becomes a poet, composer, or architect, sculptor, musician or painter, in the proportion in which he receives the revelation of beauty in his aesthetic nature, allows it to be flooded with beauty;—beauty which may be defined as the smile of all that God has made; and as we find it reproduced in works of art. The ideal, the archetypes in the divine mind, the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual; the poetic conceptions and elements; the roots and germs of the reason, if these are not found, we only deal with the material, and the outward forms; and fail to reach the essential basis; the vital force which pervades and animates the material.

More than this, there is an ideal found in man's religious history. There is a divine pattern revealed along the line of human history. We cannot pursue the nature, or the mode of the life of the Supreme Being. But we can observe and learn many things, which he has created, as we unfold their nature and use them in the affairs of life in the exercise of our reasoning nature. Christian artists are the priests of nature, man, and God. And there is not an inch on earth's broad domain, where there are

not thoughts from God, constituting that point a shrine for man's worship and priestly offerings.

God reveals himself in the true, the beautiful and the good. We learn to feed our souls from these exquisite revelations of himself.

We are the spectators and admirers of an ever-changing and marvelous universe which is filled with living charms and with new surprises every hour of life.

They twinkle in the stars—

They flash in the sunshine and load the summer air.

The strength and the power of man, the grace and the beauty of woman, are in this material sanctuary, nature. The architect copies the forms of tree and mountain and cave in his arches, turrets and spires. He spreads on canvas the colors of the sunset and sunrise, Autumn and Spring, Summer and Winter. He cuts into the marble the beauty of the human form, after studying it as an ideal, as it was created by divine power.

But God is manifest in matter, flesh and spirit. He creates, disposes, and groups forms, colors. The charms of this beautiful earth, sky and water is the result of harmonizing all these elements. He created all the departments that exist for reproduction, combination and harmony. But his love, his goodness, his holiness, and his righteousness and truth, soar beyond all things seen and temporal, and constitute the everlasting beauty in the perfect man, Christ. In the evening hour, when the sun descends below the horizon, and his mellow rays are thrown back from fleecy clouds, which hang in folds and reefs along the western sky, tinged with golden hues, so rich and so variegated, a pious heart may innocently contemplate it as imaging forth to earthly expectants the drapery of those mansions of the heavenly temple, which are intended and prepared for the redeemed.

All the works of God, this vast universe of worlds, are made after the thoughts, the ideas, and the ideals found in the divine mind. On this same principle, the artist makes a painting or a piece of statuary after the idea and the picture in his mind. The works of God are made after his pure, clear and serene thoughts, or perfect ideals. We see the works of the infinite

artist in the crystallization of a rock, and in the vast revolutions of a world that rolls in space. The glory of God as a creative artist is made known in his works, and his works are patterns of his thoughts and ideas. By the use of the telescope, the eye penetrates to distant worlds, gathers truth from imperial distances which seemingly belong to God alone. In the use of the microscope, we reveal hitherto unseen realms of life and beauty, unknown forms of being, in earth, air and water, and in the food we eat.

A certain portion of God's created works are infinitely great, and fearfully exact in modes. Another portion are infinitely little in form and size, far below the natural sight to behold. The power of the infinite is seen in the care he exercises over the infinitely great and the elegantly little.

The serenely beautiful and majestic works of God are only the shadows in concrete forms, of the thoughts of the divine mind. As in the beauty of the wild wood flower, we see the beauty and grandeur of his creative nature, partially reflected, so in the hills and the mountains and in the surging of the boundless ocean, we see hints of his infinity.

We observe the marvelous works of God. We think about them, and find law and order all through them. We find part joined to part, and when we consider them in our narrow and limited way, we go through the process, and we learn to think God's thoughts after him.

God may have had many original plans. From these he selected the one plan and order which now exists in peerless beauty. The present moral system was before him as an ideal, and then he gave it a real and material form. He created all truth; all beauty; all goodness. He created angels and men. He has given us a wide margin in which to exercise our powers and use our freedom. We are indeed hemmed in by the bounds of time and space, and on these broad theatres of action we conceive plans; we form the order for our lives; we execute for our pleasure and profit and for the elevation of our moral, intellectual and spiritual nature, and for the advancement of truth and righteousness in the world.

There is not a moment of time in which the divine energy

does not operate in sustaining and keeping the universe of mind and matter in orderly and harmonious action. And as disciples of Christ, we are to be workers with God, as he was, in that we read, John 5 : 17, my Father worketh and I work.

## II. Man is a secondary artist.

Taught in the school of nature, providence and revelation, man becomes a worker in the wide field of nature, now so wasted by sin and shorn of beauty.

The germs of an artistic life are found in every rational soul. He who with the force of natural genius pierces the inner secrets of nature and embraces within his eagle glance the wide horizon of her glory, and who, having enjoyed the seer's privilege, can paint, or in some form delineate his vision for the benefit of others, so that they can read the deeply pictured page—he is a human, creative artist, and a priest of nature and art. He who reposes on the lap of mother earth and at her veiled bosom worships, or gathers a single flower, and with it illustrates the truth and beauty and goodness of God, as seen in nature, is one of this order.

We take this material, moral and spiritual universe just as it is, and would not find fault with the works of the Great Creator. And we are to put forth our calm might and do our part in creating fine spiritual, artistic forms, out of what was once fallen, sinful natures. We can mould them into new forms of beauty, as the artist takes the Parian marble and moulds and forms it after ideas that are in his own mind.

Copying nature, the works of God, and thus conceiving or executing some new design, we call it art. The epithet poet, or creator, is as ancient as art itself and is one of the primary, philosophical conceptions of the Greek mind. As applied to God, the Supreme Cause, we cannot comprehend it. It is far beyond the reach of man's longest line of thought, and is rooted in eternity.

“Eternity! a truth that's not conceived,  
By feeble human mind it is believed;  
He takes the truth that revelation gives  
And by his faith it is the Christian lives.”

And as we are allied to the spirit of the ideal man, and the

truth, beauty and goodness which He reveals, and reproduce it in the minds and hearts of men, do we resemble the Divine Artist.

An artist is one who does good work of a certain kind. He puts things in a telling form; they stay put; and they keep telling.

He works with the body after the ideas and plans of the soul. He has an animating principle within; and he gives an outward and sensible form. An artist is one who gives expression by the hand or the voice, for the eye or the ear, "whether in space as the arts of design, or in time as the vocal arts, or in both space and time, as the drama or the landscape gardening, which imply mass and motion in space and time."

The origin and the idea of art, and the mission of the Christian artist is in God. And in all his works there is the tendency to create beauty, unfold truth, and promote goodness.

The good and the worth of art in nature is under man, and both from God. You look on the inanimate forms of art and design, the marvelous creations of human genius, with much pleasure. You consider those creations designated the Fine Arts, as architecture, sculpture, painting, poetry and music, and prose literature.

You see what cannot possibly exist on lifeless canvas, or in the cold and dead marble form, or in the cloud capped temple or gorgeous cathedral—namely the thoughts, the ideas, ideals, and the purest spiritual conceptions which were the patterns and ensamples after which the creations were formed.

Thus also when you look on the grand and the beautiful works of our heavenly father, you see back of them and at their root the ideas of the divine mind; the forms of things unseen, unheard and untouched. Socrates, the wisest and the best of men, but once one of the most corrupt, was like his father, in early life, a sculptor. At the age of thirty-five he threw aside his graver's tools, and instead of turning Parian marble into the similitude of men, engaged in the elevated and heavenly calling of turning men into the similitude of God, or of the divine image. When he abandoned mallet and pick for the teacher's

chair this ancient worthy became an artist in a more exalted sense than before.

The essential difference in his vocation was that while he had been dealing with insensate materials from the marble quarry, he was now dealing with the lives, the minds, souls of living men. His aim and work had been to fashion into forms of beauty and speechless grandeur the perishable stone, while now it is the passion of his life to fashion into some of the forms of truth or duty the thinking principle, the immortal mind. Judged by whatever standard, it must be admitted, that the highest art is that which consisteth, not so much in giving coloring, however brilliant, or form, however graceful or exquisite, to animate any perishable form, as in quickening dead souls, in advancing human character, in shaping human beings after the pattern, or into the likeness of Jesus Christ.

And what indeed can well be nobler than this art which has for its object the building, not of cathedrals, but of manhood; the restoration of the defaced and fallen architecture of the human soul; and the training again of something beautiful to see, and grateful to the soul, around the crumbling altars and broken arches of the desolate temple of the human heart.

In our sacred books there is revealed an ideal, a divine pattern; and during many centuries of man's religious history, this has been studied. The perfect archetype is revealed in four evangelists. Having passed into the heavens, the moral image of Jesus, if regarded as nothing more than an idea, is the noblest and dearest heritage of humanity.

This ideal is before us as a pattern and it will not grow dim, neither have we yet found their equal excellence among men. And the longer we contemplate this matchless one, the more do we realize that he is the chief among ten thousand, and how poor we are in humanity and love and refined purity. But he is painted in such colors that it is impossible to contemplate the picture without its irresistibly affecting the heart.

During the existence of man on the earth, God has brooded lovingly over the earth and man. While the natural world of sight and sound has been full of change God has been steady in the administration of goodness. And we become secondary

artists when we enter into the deep sympathies of his great nature, in his plans, ways and efforts and works and thoughts, to restore men, though we may not be as perfect as the master.

It is the glory of a human soul to employ time and strength, in this exalted pursuit—in this life and action in which God is engaged.

God creates life. He is its author, preserver and benefactor. Man is a co-worker with God, when he carries onward the grand plans and ways of the creator, in subduing and using nature and also in moulding into fine spiritual forms the souls, the entire nature of men. We may be sure that God has in his heart an image and a thought of each one of us. And so poor is our realization of this thought, ideal and image, that were we to see it, we would be humbled and put to shame. We have dim conceptions of what we should be.

### III. The materials on which the Christian artist works.

These are men, women, children. These are individuals, personalities, beings marked with rational life and spiritual activity. The secondary artist works on beings of his own nature, with souls, the deathless mind, spiritual in essence, and endless in duration.

How small the word; how numerous the beings it represents; and how potent the meaning; how vast its destiny.

“What a piece of work is man.  
How noble in reason.  
How infinite in faculties.  
In form and moving how express and admirable.  
In action how like an angel.  
In apprehension how like a God.  
The beauty of the world.  
The paragon of animals.”

“What a concentration of energies; what a gathering up of solemn thoughts; what a home of dear and gentle affections; what a fountain of tears and sorrows are found in this spiritual enclosure.”

What fearful powers sleep within its folds, and how it surges within, like a seething volcano. How the human bosom swells with grief, and the eye flashes with passion. What images of the grand, drawn from nature, gleams of what at times seems

godlike and destined to be eternal, lie hidden in its unfathomable depths.

Endowed with powers to commune with nature, man and the infinite, a reflection of the brightness of heaven, a mirror that collects and concentrates within itself all the moral splendors of the universe, a light kindled in the skies, designed to brighten in splendor while eternity endures—this is the grand, great, peerless material on which the Christian artist works.

And yet, this mind is in ruins. There are through its apartments evidences of beauty and power—here and there a noble pillar, now and then a well turned arch indicating the beauty of the original structure.

The fearful work and devastation of sin, and the ugly work of the destroyer are around us. And human forms and agencies, vitiated by sin, have marred and ruined much of the good, the true, and the beautiful, along the march of the ages.

Still, the beautiful and true and good, in word and thought and deed are immortal and enduring. It is a delightful experience to call up in memory the forms, and the faces, and the sparkling eyes, and the cheerful, friendly smile of those who were our teachers in the past. The truths and thoughts they communicated, were glorious to our young and forming minds, and more than this, are immortal. Communicated to us by human agents, have we done our share to vivify the life of humanity in individuals?

And we realize the hope, that the magnificent thoughts and doctrines uttered by Jesus, and by Paul, and by uninspired Miltons, and others, men of like passions and infirmities, will live as long as mankind endures, while a sand remains in the hour glass of time, or the pillars of the world remain unshaken. And the beauty and the grandeur of the thoughts, and deeds of the truthful, the wise, and the good of all ages, have grown out of the working and combinations of the germs of thought and deeds and eternal laws shaped, expressed and executed by the infinite. The human, creative artist, taking up these divine thoughts, elaborating and combining them anew, has given them a victorious propagation among men, and along the line of the centuries and the ages.

And while there are thoughts, there are also forms, flowers, vine-clad hills, golden harvests, vineyards and tangled glades, and majestic forests. Crags are covered with verdure. Fields are aglow with lilies. Flowers smile from Alpine summits. Pluck a flower and ask who made it. Consider its beauty, variety, and completeness and adaptation to man as a means of culture. Clearly it convinces us that reason and taste are involved in the wayside flowers that we may be instructed.

It is not the purpose of a Christian artist, or one who considers the mission of the artist, to explain the mystery of the universe. He may attempt to find the key to a higher harmony than exists, but in this he finds much that indicates discord, and a schism in man. This is a fallen world. We are in some sense in ruins. The earth is arched over with graves, and the earth itself indicates that it was made for fallen beings.

The thorn and the thistle are here, and in this briery world we find much in a physical, intellectual and moral and spiritual sense that bristles with spiny ferocity, while untold horrors are on every side during the longest periods in human history. If there is not moral ruin, why is the earth sterile? Why does the sirocco blow, and why does the angry ocean devour fleets laden with the means of human comfort and human happiness?

The race that exists on this planet is a turbulent one; and more than this, it is averse to the authority of the one who made it. Men by nature do not like to submit to the authority of God and walk in his ways. Man, the human soul, is vitiated by sin. Each and every one of our spiritual powers is defiled by sin.

There is a want of harmony of the parts. Our nature remains human nature, but it is fallen, and our disposition is averse to the thoughts, the plans and the ways of God.

Christ, the original Christian artist, came on earth the ideal man, for the purpose of restoring man. He came clothed with absolute perfections. He has all the germs of truth and purity. He has a plan, and ways for the restoration of men, through reconciliation with God. And men are co-workers with God. Our nature, disposition, and ways and character are to sin; this is the drift of the soul, the image of the evil heart. Hence, our history is a tragic one.

The Christian artist begins his work with his human subject, armed with objections against the authority of God, and with aversion to the golden rule, and with an inclination to make life easy. We look at nature, wreathed with smiles. We look at the useful, and find toil is quite essential to supply our daily wants. We are pleased with improvements which render placid and comfortable our lives. And in time we are pleased, profited, and admire the results of the fine arts. We are doomed to toil, and it is for our good. We are invited to consider our soul's needs. The religion of Christ requires of us a thankful acceptance, and cheerful obedience. In adjusting ourselves to nature, man and God, we do not experience the yoke burdensome, when submissive.

The work of the Christian artist, softens while it reflects the truth, the beauty and the goodness of God.

The angular form of man, and the rude but useful creations of the mechanic, are not seemly to those who have a fine and a delicate taste, and the imagination hints the propriety of clothing it with flowing robes, and waving and spiral lines of beauty. When we make a translation from another language, we fail in an artistic sense, if we make it too literal and bald. Hence we learn to add to it the graces of a fine, but chastened rhetoric.

We do not like nature, man, or literature too literal. Hence, the imagination clothes life with the drapery and the splendor of its creations; and the archetypal ideas of the reason are made mellow with tints and tones drawn from nature's laboratory.

#### IV. The method, and the plan of this Christian, artistic work.

Many fine and good illustrations from the life of individuals, reveal to us how they were educated, and the order in their lives. We are all interested in the unfoldings of the individuality, the gatherings into the personality; and the doings of men in life.

Gray's Elegy in a Country Church Yard contains more beautiful figures and illustrations drawn from nature, and from human life, than any poem of the same length in the English language. It has also done much to create in men a disposition to consider the past and to reflect on the present and raise questions of the future. The transient affairs of this life loom up before every

reader, and there are hints of other truths which lead to consider our motives, choices, plans, and ways. Turning aside from the highway, in the winter season into an unused and almost obliterated cemetery, and deciphering the inscriptions on the moss-covered head-stones, I began to reason from facts contained on two.

From the dates, I found I was about three years of age when one man died, and I have a vivid recollection of a number of things at the funeral, and of the man once making me a present when he was well.

Two years after this the other man died, as the date showed me, and I recollect that as I wished to go to a rise of ground and see the funeral procession, I learned to tell the time on the dial-plate of the clock, that I might go at the time the procession would appear in the line of vision. Going forth at the designated time there rested before my eyes the cemetery, where the rude forefathers and foremothers of the region sleep; and stretching away in the distance that imperial panorama, the valley of the Hudson, earth, sky, water; woodland and cultivated field; the Catskills, where the woodman cut the hemlock on the mountain; the valley where the hunter once chased the antelope, or threw the lasso on the plain.

The old man of the mountains rested there defined against the western horizon, as if cut with a diamond, or arched into the blue heavens, (but I had not the eye of an Irving to see it). Counting the vehicles in the procession I had also the curious workings of thought concerning death, life and kindred subjects. In after years rambling over the hills, and in the woods of the mountain ranges, which extend from the grand white mountains on the north, and constitute the highlands of the Hudson, and extend far into the regions of the sunny South, and where day-dreams are in accordance with nature, I raised the question, what is this I? this soul that thinks; what is its destiny? Will all men die? Do they live forever? Thus have I shouted question after question into the Sybil cave of destiny, and received no answer but an echo; no audible voice, but a stimulating answer from nature, the human soul, and the pages of a well accredited revelation. Thus the soul opens to truth.

- 1st. There must be an open soul.
- 2d. Learning to fix the attention.
- 3d. Aspiration to measures upon earth.
- 4th. These will secure development.
- 5th. Growth of mind is along the same line far out in the measures of time, space, and number and more.
- 6th. Culture in the finest and largest sense.
- 7th. Fulness of life comes, as material prosperity arises from industry and other qualities found in the same order in life.

The golden age of some forms of the fine arts, as painting, statuary and architecture seems for the time to have vanished from the brain and hand of man. Poets and composers of music scarcely rival those now numbered with the dead. But the lustre and the glory of a few is now the heritage of many. A better age is upon us.

An age of elevating men and women, boys and girls into forms and ways of pure and imperishable beauty, and of imperial spiritual grandeur has dawned on our world. The art of the chisel may be lost in a measure, and the beauty hidden in the marble may elude the skill of the artist. The power of rendering the human face and form on canvas may fail of exhibiting its highest skill and artistic finish. But we have gained the power and mastery over finer materials than was ever wrought into form by Grecian or Italian artists.

The human soul has been moulded and formed into ideals of peerless beauty. The old masters carved Apollo Belvideres, Laocoons, and gods and goddesses of rare beauty. They painted altar pieces, and frescoes; and the marble could almost seem to speak, and the canvas blush a roseate hue. But in the school of the Perfect, the ideal artist, we have learned to lay the guiding, forming hand on human souls, candidates for eternal life, and to help them on their way in becoming priests and kings unto God.

It is the glory of the artist who painted the Sistine Madonna. We almost envy the power and skill of the man who painted the Last Supper; or who carved the reviled Christ; or Moses as taken from the floating cradle on the Nile.

But it is something on which we may feel a little humble pride, or pleasure, if from some shy, awkward girl, we have helped to develop and unfold and mature a Harriet Newell, or a Mary Lyon, or a Fidelia Fiske; and out of some shy boy, a Harlan Page, or an honest, and an inflexible and unflinchingly incorrupt judge; or a lawyer, who in halls wherein the wronged seek justice, is firm and reliable for integrity and principle; or the man of business who in the marts of labor and trade is faithful to religious conviction, and political duties and domestic and social life. We often have low thoughts, and we have the tendency to fall under their powers, as well as rise above them.

It is a noble work as the poet well says

"To send the Doric column to the skies :  
Pile towers on towers, and build up mausoleums  
To human vanity. \* \* \*  
To make the marble speak, the canvas glow,  
The heart leap into eloquence, or trip  
To the light numbers of the poet's creed."

This may be grand and noble in its way, but it is nobler and grander to incite men to live for high actions, aims, and purposes, comporting with, and rendered noble and pure with truth; to awaken the slow, sluggish soul with new-born hopes; to create blissful feelings where souls were burdened with woe.

We may put forth efforts, and lead men to songs, more spontaneous than the statue of Memnon ever uttered, when the rays of the morning sun first touched his silent, and cold marble; or than a prima donna ever sung, and through the instruction in truth, send to weary and sad souls dreams of paradise, to visit pillows once made sorrowful with thorns of sin. "Is this not nobler, indeed, than to shape the semblance of divinest contour or feature on the cold, dead marble, or to sing the longest Iliad ever dreamed of?"

Teachers in every department and every grade are artists, and sculptors and painters, and musicians and poets.

"Into your hand hath been committed material more precious by far than all the marbles of Carrara or Pentitucus. Yours is the rare privilege of tracing on the imperial cope of memory forms of beauty that shall outlast, by eternal ages, all the frescoes of a Raphael. Be faithful to your high trust. Grow not weary in well-doing."

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION AS AN ECONOMIC ISSUE, OR THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN ITS RELATION TO THE FARMER, THE LABORER, THE MERCHANT AND TO SOCIETY.

By REV. SAMUEL SCHWARM, A. M., Tiffin, O.

The temperance question is not merely a moral question, but it is, first of all, an economic question. Those engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors claim that theirs is a legitimate and important industry; that owing to the very large amount of capital invested (estimated at a billion of dollars, with an annual income of nine hundred millions) and the many men employed (estimated all told, in manufactures, wholesale, retail, etc., at five hundred and seventy-five thousand) that it is one of the principal industries of the country and conduces to the welfare of society. The brewers of the United States, in an essay distributed at the Centennial celebration in 1876, say: "The brewers are just as necessary to the common weal as the butcher, the baker, the tailor, the builder, or any other economic industry;" and they say further, "The trade, the business, and the calling of the brewer is just as much an integral part of a state as any other necessary calling, and without it something would be lacking for the general good." They claim, therefore, that the branch of industry which they represent, is entitled to demand from the national government, and from the several state legislatures, the same recognition and protection as any other. The distillers virtually make the same claims in behalf of their business. The Liquor Dealers' Association, composed of both brewers and distillers, scattered broadcast over the state of Ohio, a few days before the vote on the Second Amendment, a circular, in which they stated how much money they had invested in this industry in the state, how many men they employed, how many bushels of grain they used, how many horses they kept, and how many buildings they occupied, etc. They claimed that the passing of that amendment meant the destruction of that amount of money, the throwing out of employment

so many men, and out of use so many buildings, and out of a market so many bushels of grain and so many horses, etc. They tried to impress the people of the state, and especially the farmers, with the idea that theirs was one of the great and important industries of the state and that its destruction would be a public calamity.

Now the foregoing is undoubtedly the view of the liquor industry that those who are connected with it entertain of it. And it is not merely the idea of those who are connected with it, but it is also the idea of many who are not directly engaged in it. The farmer thinks that the destruction of the liquor industry would destroy a market for grain, the laborer thinks it would destroy a market for labor, the merchant thinks it would destroy a market for his articles of trade, and the capitalist thinks it would destroy an investment for his money; and hence they are not very zealous for its destruction, though they see that it has great evils following in its train. Are these parties right? Is the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors a profitable industry to the farmer, the laborer, the merchant, and to society in general? Does it really add to the happiness and welfare of society? Would its prohibition, or destruction, be a public calamity? Would the evils following its destruction be greater than those acknowledged to be connected with the industry? These are questions which a great many persons, if not a majority of persons in the United States, would answer in the affirmative. It will not do to merely say that these persons are insincere in their views concerning the liquor industry, and that they are governed by their appetites. Denunciations are not arguments, and denunciations will not change opinions. Many of those persons hold these opinions because they have never studied the subject. They do know that the liquor industry does furnish a market for a certain amount of produce, labor, etc., but they have never considered what, if any thing, would take the place of this market if this industry were destroyed. They have never taken the pains to compare the amount of the purchases, and the amount of the labor employed, by this industry, with that of other industries. Now we shall endeavor to answer these questions by making a comparison between this,

so-called, industry and some of the other industries of the country. And, I think, it will be conceded that the industry that employs the largest number of laborers, pays the most in wages, uses the most raw and prepared material, and manufactures the most useful and valuable products, is the most beneficial to the farmer, laborer, merchant, and to society in general, and that it deserves the greatest encouragement. Keeping this in view let us go to the tenth, and last, census of the United States and see whether the claims made in behalf of the liquor industry can be substantiated.

In 1880 there were three thousand one hundred and fifty-two (3152) places in the United States where liquors, distilled, malt and vinous, were manufactured. These manufactories had an invested capital of one hundred and eighteen million, twenty-seven thousand, seven hundred and twenty-nine (\$118,027,729) dollars; they employed 33,698 persons; they paid in wages 15,078,574 dollars; they used material to the value of 85,921,374 dollars, and their manufactured products were estimated at 144,-291,241 dollars.

In the same year (1880) there were 20,313 places where agricultural implements, boots and shoes, including custom work and repairing, but not including rubber goods, were made. These establishments employed a capital of 118,657,333 dollars; they employed 178,218 persons; they paid in wages 67,711,736 dollars; they used material to the value of 154,073,915 dollars; and their manufactured products were worth 276,034,389 dollars.

By making a comparison we find that 118 millions of dollars employed in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors gave employment to 33,689 individuals. The same amount, almost, employed in the manufacture of agricultural implements, boots and shoes, etc., employed 178,218 individuals. One hundred and eighteen millions of dollars employed in the former paid to labor 15,027,579 dollars, in the latter it paid to labor 67,711,736 dollars. One hundred and eighteen millions of dollars employed in the former bought of the farmers and other producers of this country material to the value of 85,921,374 dollars; in the latter it bought of the farmers and other producers material to the value of 154,073,915 dollars. So 118 millions employed in the

manufacture of agricultural implements, boots and shoes, employed five and one third times as many individuals, it paid to labor four and one half times as much in wages, it bought of the farmers, etc., about twice as much material, and its manufactured products were worth twice as much money, as the same amount of capital invested in the manufacture of liquor. And besides, the former was distributed to 20,000 localities, while the latter was confined to 3,000 places, mostly large cities.

Now which is the more profitable industry? Tested in this way the liquor industry cannot stand a comparison with that of the manufacture of agricultural implements and boots and shoes. In the number of individuals employed, the amount of wages paid, the amount of material used, and the number of places benefited it falls far behind. But some one may say, You have made the most unfavorable comparison possible for the liquor industry. I do not believe that that is the case. I have taken these industries with which to compare it because the capital invested is nearly the same. But to satisfy the objector let us continue. If we take the products of all the mechanical industries of the country, the liquor industry included, we will find that nearly one fifth of their value has gone to the laborer, while taking the liquor industry alone we will find that only about one tenth has gone to the laborer; *i.e.*, the total products of all the manufactories of the country represent about twenty dollars out of every one hundred in labor, while the products of the liquor manufactory represent only about ten dollars out of every one hundred in labor. And now again, if we take the manufactories of the country as a whole, the liquor interest included (if it were excluded the ratio would be still higher) we will find that for every 1019 dollars of capital invested they employ one laborer, while we will find, if we take the liquor manufactories alone, that they employ only one laborer to every 5,580 dollars of capital invested. So we find that the manufactories of the country as a whole pay out of their products twice as much to the laborer, and employ five times as many individuals, as the same amount of capital does when invested in the manufacture of liquor. So this boasted industry does not do one half as well for the laborer, etc., as even the average industry of the country

does. This alone ought to be sufficient to condemn it in the judgment of those who have produce or labor to sell. But this is not all. Let us see if we cannot find out what proportion of the amount that the consumer pays for these different manufactured products goes to the laborer. There is a much larger increase in the price of the manufactured products of the liquor industry from the time they leave the factory and by the time they get into the hands of the consumer, than there is in the products of industries in general. Twenty-five per cent. is supposed to be a sufficient allowance for the increase of price of the products of industries in general from the time they leave the factory until they get into the hands of the consumer. But the increase of price of the products of the liquor manufactories, as they pass from the factories to the consumer, is from one hundred to five hundred per cent. It has been estimated that the liquors, for which the manufacturers in 1880 realized 144,000,000 of dollars, cost the consumers 700,000,000 of dollars, *i.e.*, counting 40 per cent. as the test of alcohol in retail spirits, and estimating the retail price of domestic spirits at six dollars per gallon, and of domestic beer and ale at twenty dollars per barrel. (This does not represent the whole liquor bill of the United States for 1880, but merely the bill for the home made article). Now what part of every one hundred dollars out of this 700,000,000 dollars went into the pockets of the laborers of this country? Why just about two dollars! And what part of every one hundred dollars of the retail price of manufactured products in general went into the pockets of the laborers of this country? Fourteen dollars, or just seven times as much! If the 700,000,000 dollars had been spent in miscellaneous industries instead of paying 15,000,000 dollars to labor it would have paid 105,000,000, which would have been a clear gain of 90,000,000 of dollars. But some of the various industries pay a much better per cent. to labor than the average, for example, for every one hundred dollars paid for hardware or furniture in 1880 twenty-four dollars went to labor to produce it, and for every one hundred paid for boots and shoes twenty dollars went to labor. Thus if the 700,000,000 dollars had been spent in industries as profitable to labor as hardware and furniture, instead of

the 15,000,000 which the laborer did get he would have gotten 180,000,000, or a clear gain of 165,000,000. The 700,000,000 spent for liquors in 1880 gave to the producers 7,500,000 days work at two dollars per day. If it had been spent for the products of manufactoryes in general it would have given them 52,500,000 days work at the same price, or seven times more, or if it had been spent for products of manufacture as profitable to the laborer as hardware and furniture, it would have given them 90,000,000 days work, or twelve times as much as it actually did. Or to put it in another light, if it had been used in promiscuous manufacturing, instead of giving employment to 33,689 persons, it would have given employment to 235,823; or if spent in the more laborious industries it would have given employment to 404,268 individuals.

There has been of late years a great hue and cry about "hard times" because of the scarcity of labor. Idle laborers make poor customers for the farmer, the merchant, the miller, etc. The wages of the producer are the purchasing power of the nation. If the producer has no work, he earns nothing and, consequently, buys nothing, or else buys on credit. This is what, to a certain extent, has caused the hard times of late years. Plenty of profitable labor is what is needed. How shall it be gotten? If this great amount of capital that was expended for the product of the distillery, the brewery and the wine press had been expended in the manufacture of the more profitable products it would have given constant employment to more than 300,000 more persons than it did. And besides it would have made use of more than 485,000,000 dollars worth of material instead of 85,000,000. The production of this material would have given employment, even at 600 dollars per year, to 808,000 more laborers. Thus the proper employment of this 700,000,000 of dollars would have given constant work to over one million men. This estimate is not too high, it is below instead of above the real figures; for 948,000,000 dollars paid out in wages by all the manufactoryes of the country in 1880 gave employment to 2,700,000 persons, at this rate the 700,000,000 would have given employment to nearly two millions. The 195,000,000 of dollars paid in wages by our railways in 1880 gave employment

to 419,000 men, even at this rate the 700,000,000 would have given employment to more than 1,520,000 men instead of to less than 200,000. Now these figures may be a little dry, but nevertheless it would pay the laboring and business men of this country to nibble at them occasionally. They would be more apt to bite into the real cause of hard times than by nibbling away at the old food—tariff, free trade, over-production, Republican and Democratic crookedness, etc., etc., which the politicians set up to them.

We have examined this so-called great industry in regard to work provided, wages paid, materials used, etc., let us now examine it in regard to the value and benefit of its products, and see whether it can make a better showing. Some articles are so beneficial to society that they must be manufactured though at great expense. How is it in regard to the products of the still, the brewery and the wine press? In order that any individual may not be a burden to society, or the country, he must return, at least, an equivalent for what he receives. It will not answer for him to receive valuable goods and return such as are of no real value. That is no better, if as good, as to return nothing. Political economy teaches us that "every individual who is not producing valuable goods, or adding by his labor to the welfare of the community in some form, at least to the amount which he receives, is a burden to society." It divides society into two classes, and only two; producers and non-producers. If a person does not produce, or help produce, anything of real value to society he is a burden, and is supported either as a worthy object of charity or is merely tolerated as an unavoidable nuisance. This latter is the case of the tramp, of the thief, and of the criminal classes. They, leech like, suck the life blood of the community and return nothing of value. Now what is true of individuals is also true of organized industries, for they are merely the association of individuals for the manufacture of various articles. Now if any, so called, industry fails to render to society useful products, at least to the extent it receives from the community, it becomes a burden. A farmer goes to a manufacturing establishment and buys a harvester.

It proves itself to be utterly worthless. That farmer has been injured, at least to the amount the machine cost him in money and in valuable time. Such manufactories are a detriment to a community, at least to the extent to which they succeed in selling such machines. Now, keeping this law of equivalents in mind, let us test some of the different industries of the land. If the liquor business is a great industry it can stand the test as well as any other and it need not shirk it. Let us begin with the farmer, for all will admit that the farming industry is a great, if not the greatest industry of our country. The farmer receives money from the community. What does he give it in return for that money? He gives it wheat, corn, oats, hay, horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, butter, eggs, etc., etc., things without which no community could possibly exist. Hence the farmer is looked upon as an absolute necessity. The prosperity of the farmer means the comfort and welfare of the entire community.

We next take the mechanic, for next to the farm stands the work or machine shop. The mechanic receives money from the society. What does he give it in return? Houses and their furniture, plows, wagons, reapers, threshers, railroads and their equipments, and so on indefinitely. It would be impossible for any community to make much progress without the labor and the skill of the mechanic. No man is able to provide for all of his wants unaided and make much progress. He can make much more effective use of his time by confining himself to some special calling and by exchanging his products in that line with men working in other callings for such things as he may need or desire. No one, possessing good judgment, will question the statement that the mechanic is a useful and indispensable member of society. And by mechanic I do not mean merely those who labor with machinery or on machines, but also those who live by useful hand labor.

We might next call up the merchant as a representative of the great commercial industry. The merchant is not a direct producer. He is, at best, an indirect or assistant producer. And hence it is the more necessary that he be required to give an account of the money he receives. He receives a great deal of money from the community. What does he give it in return

for that he receives? It is necessary for the prosperity of the farmer that he be enabled to get clothes, utensils, machinery, etc.; and it is equally necessary to the welfare of the laborer and the mechanic that they get the articles produced by the farmer. But these men have not time to make a success of their business, or calling, and yet hunt each other up to make all of these different exchanges. The merchant, therefore, to facilitate matters gathers up their various products and they come to him and make their exchanges. Thus they are saved a great deal of time and can afford to pay the merchant something, in the line of profit, for his trouble. The merchant is a time saver for the producers and thus he increases their power of production and becomes a very useful member of the community.

And in this way we might continue and call up the teacher, the preacher, the doctor, etc., each of which probably would be able to show satisfactorily that he added to the welfare and happiness of society. But let us now call up the representative of the liquor industry, which is claimed to be a great industry. Those he represents receive, as we have seen, great sums of money from the community. What do they give it in return? He replies, We give it fine liquors—wines, whiskies, ales, etc. These add much to the welfare of society. Suppose he were to make such an answer, and probably he would, any boy ten years old would know that facts are against him. Any little boy of ten years of age has witnessed enough to know that liquor adds nothing to the welfare and happiness of a community. But we say to the representative of the liquor interest, You are not honest, you are not sincere. Now answer truthfully, Is the man who has used your liquors for one, or five, or ten years any better off than he would have been had he never used them? Has his power to produce valuable products been increased? Has not this power to a certain extent, at least, been destroyed? He in reply admits that liquor makes some men stagger and roll into the gutter, that it makes some quarrelsome and fiendish, that it leads others to rob their wives and little ones of the very necessities of life. He even admits that many of the crimes that are perpetrated in society have their origin in liquor. But he strenuously maintains that this is the outcome of an abuse

and not the results of a legitimate use. It is a hard thing against the liquor interest that its products are so liable to be abused. Who ever heard of a man going away from a butcher shop, or a dry goods store, or a Sunday school, or a church, to beat his wife and children and to quarrel with his neighbors? But let us call up one of the men who have used these liquors for a long time and has not made, what the liquor dealer calls, an abuse of them, but has used them moderately. We say to him, You have been drinking this man's liquors for years, you have been giving him a good part of your earnings, what have they done for you? Have they made you healthier, wealthier or wiser? The best he dare say, if he is honest, is that he does not know that they have done him any harm. There are many moderate drinkers who will claim this, but there are not many who will claim that they are better off, while there are many of them who will freely admit that they would be much better off if they had never tasted intoxicating liquors. There are many of them who will freely admit that the money spent for these liquors is worse than wasted, and that they are sorry that they ever formed the habit of drinking. And there is no doubt but what their friends and families are sorry too. If this be the case with the moderate drinker, what must it not be with the habitual drunkard.

But let us give the liquor interest another chance. We cannot afford to be unfair, nor do we need to be. It is claimed that this is one of the great and important industries of the country, that it is just as necessary to the welfare of the state as any other industry. Now let the liquor representative stand his customers along by the side of those who claim that liquors are not necessary and have, consequently, never used them, and there are plenty such with which to make the comparison, and let him show wherein they are better. I seem to see the line forming before me. At the one end are the Teetotalers and their families, at the other end are the drinkers and their families. At which end do you suppose one would find the puffed face, the bleared eye, the marks of shame and disease, the marks of sorrow and awful suffering on the faces of innocent women and children, the marks of infamy and crime, the gambler and the

thief, the jail bird and the thug? Every one knows what the awful contrast would be. The liquor industry could not be hired to enter such an exhibition. They are glad when their finished work gets into the alms houses, jails, etc., and away from the notice of the public.

This so-called great industry is taking immense sums of money from the people of this country every year. The yearly drink bill of this country is now generally estimated at 900,000,000 of dollars. Mr. Powderly has lately told us that the class of people who are commonly known as laborers spend 400,000,000 of dollars annually for liquors. What have they to show for it? Has it eased up the hard times for them? Are their families better fed, better clothed, more comfortable and intelligent because of this great outlay? Are our merchants any better because of this *great* industry? Are the patrons of the liquor interests their best customers? Is it not true that if a farmer or laborer, who is addicted to the use of liquors, comes into a town with one dollar in his pocket, that he will spend that dollar for drink and then ask the merchant to trust him for the necessities of life? Is it not true that many men spend the money in the saloon that ought to be spent for food, for clothing, for furniture, for home adornments, and leave their families and homes without these blessings; and that the legitimate merchant loses this trade just because of the liquor industry? But we are told that the liquor dealer buys these things. But he is merely one where his patrons are a hundred. Where the merchant sells him one suit of clothes he misses the sale of a hundred suits to his patrons. Where the merchant sells him one book or picture he misses the sale of a hundred books and pictures to his customers.

What relation then does the liquor industry sustain to other industries and to society in general? In order not to be a burden on the community we have shown that it must at least return an equivalent for what it receives. But we have shown that this industry does not return any thing of real value for the immense sums it receives. Is it any better, therefore, and does it deserve to be ranked higher, than the pauper, the tramp, the thief, and the criminal classes? Is it not a veritable leech sucking

ing the life blood of the community and returning nothing but poison? Is not the liquor traffic on our body politic just what the lice and scab, etc., are on the bodies of animals? Is it not what the fly and chinch bug and weevil and rust, etc., are to our growing crops? It is all these and a great deal more as we will find later. I know that there are persons who contend that there is nourishment in these liquors, especially in beer, and that, consequently, the money spent for them is not a total loss. But facts and science are against them. One of the foremost of German chemists has said that he could demonstrate mathematically that a man could take as much nourishment on the point of a knife blade by dipping it into a sack of flour as there is in two gallons of beer, and that if a man were to drink two gallons of beer per day for a year, he would get just about as much nourishment out of it as there is in three pounds of beef steak. Now who would want to drink 730 gallons of beer in order to catch a loaf of bread or three pounds of steak, or who would want to pay in addition four hundred and seventy-five dollars for it. (It is not for the nourishment that is in them that these liquors are bought and drunk). The 900,000,000 of dollars spent per year in this country for these liquors are a total loss. They are just as much a loss as they would be were they destroyed by fire, or by flood, or by famine, or by foreign invasion. It would be better for the government to pay every one of the 575,000 persons engaged in this liquor industry one thousand dollars per year to get them to quit the business. The people of this country would save 325,000,000 of dollars by such a transaction.

But 900,000,000 of dollars annually is not the total waste caused by the liquor industry. To this we can add the loss of the productive labor of 575,000 men. This at six hundred dollars per year is 345,000,000 of dollars. And to this we can add the loss of at least half of the labor of 800,000 drunkards. This is not a high estimate of the number of drunkards. The lowest estimate places the number of saloons at 200,000. Now count four drunkards to each saloon and we have an army of 800,000. The loss of half of their labor at six hundred dollars per year is 240,000,000 of dollars. Now suppose that each of

these saloons has ten hard drinkers and we have an army of two millions of hard drinkers. Now suppose that their power to produce valuable articles and to occupy responsible positions is injured to the extent of one hundred dollars each per year, and we have 200,000,000 more to add to the above amounts. And then it is estimated that from one third to one half of the sickness of civilized nations is caused by intoxicating drinks. The death rate among moderate drinkers even has been found by the United Kingdom (British) insurance company, in an experience of fifty years, to be thirty-three per cent. greater than among teetotalers. It has been estimated that in New York City there is one case of alcoholic sickness to every one hundred and forty-five of the population. Of course in the country districts the ratio is not near so large. But suppose there is one case of sickness caused by liquor to every three hundred of the population of this country, and we have 166,666 persons simultaneously sick. Now count their medical attendance and expense at one dollar per day, and we have 60,000,000 dollars for doctor bills and expense in sickness, and count the loss of labor at one dollar per day and we have 60,000,000 more. Now count the cost of the support of 84,000 defective persons, such as insane, idiots, imbeciles, etc., made so through strong drink, at two hundred dollars per year and we have 17,000,000 of dollars. Add the cost of supporting 59,000 paupers, made such by drink, at one hundred per year, and we have 6,000,000 dollars. To this add the loss of the labor of these 59,000 paupers at three hundred per year and we have about 18,000,000 more. And now add the cost of supporting 39,000 prisoners at one hundred dollars per year and the loss of their labor at three hundred each per year and we have more than 15,000,000. We might add the cost of extra police, of prosecutions, of courts, of jails, of alms houses, of insane asylums. These alone would amount to millions. We might add the loss accruing to employers through drinking employees, such as imperfect work, accidents, delays, etc., these would be millions more. We might add the destruction of 30,000,000 bushels of grain, etc., but we will leave this to the reader. Adding together simply the figures we have given we have more than 950,000,000 of dollars. Now add to

this the direct liquor bill of the nation and we have the enormous sum of more than 1,800,000,000 of dollars. We cannot form any adequate idea of that amount of money. It would build and equip a double-tracked railroad around the globe at the cost of 75,000 dollars per mile. It would buy every horse, cow, mule, hog, sheep, goat, chicken, etc., in the United States. It would buy every church, school house, charitable and public institution in the country. It would almost buy every thing raised on all the farms in the United States in one year, for all the farm products, consumed, sold and on hand in 1879 amounted to but 2,213,402,564 dollars.

But these figures do not tell the story of the curse of the liquor industry. They say nothing about the tears, the heart aches, the shame and suffering of the hundred thousands of women and children. We can approximate the awful drain upon the resources of the country, but the great book of God's reckoning alone can reveal the sorrow and the awful wrongs caused by this terrible industry. If I were to attempt to draw a picture of this festering sore upon the fair face of our God given country I could not do it so well as it has been done by others, hence I prefer to give their pictures. Senator Windom, ex-Secretary of the Treasury, a man well qualified to speak on this subject has drawn this picture: "It is estimated that there are 200,000 saloons. Their proprietors, together with the distillers, brewers, etc., make, at a low estimate, an army of 500,000 persons. They employ a capital usually estimated at one billion of dollars. Its annual income is estimated at 900 millions. If we allow each of these saloons a frontage of 22 feet we will have a solid row on each side of a street of over 400 miles long. If they were formed into a city they would make eighty streets of five miles each, or twenty-five square miles of territory covered by nothing but saloons. Add the dwellings of the saloon keepers and we get some thirty square miles more. Add the haunts of vice, the outgrowth of drink, the houses of the gamblers, drunkards, cut-throats, plug-uglies and base politicians, and we have one hundred and twenty square miles of houses, with a population of 2,900,000; a city of the size of New York, Philadelphia, and Brooklyn combined. A city without a church,

a Sunday school, or a single good institution. A city in which 100,000 drunkards die annually, and the mere taxes levied for the support of paupers, idiots, maniacs and the rest amount to more than 100,000,000 of dollars. Such is the picture of the horrid city it would be. Would it were a fact and not a picture that all this iniquitous business could be shut away in one city, and not left to fester in every city, town and school district in the land, poisoning their life and washing away their substance." Gladstone, England's greatest and grandest statesman, a man who has had every opportunity to observe the effects of the liquor traffic, says, "The desolation wrought by strong drink is greater than that of war, famine and pestilence combined."

But the suffering, the loss of wealth and the loss of life, do not yet tell the whole tale of the diabolical influence of the saloon in our country. It has wound its slimy and slippery length around the ballot box, the representative, the senator, and other public servants.

We may sneer at the temperance question and try to ignore it, but it is the all-important question of the day for our country. Beside it tariff and free-trade are pygmies; they are like a kitten by the side of a Jumbo. This question is upon the people of this country. It will not down. It must be solved in some way or other. It threatens, if its evils are not abated, financial ruin as well as moral disintegration. The cry of hard times means something. The strikes and mobs show that we are sailing towards anarchy and ruin. What is the matter? Where is the secret of this unrest, this discontent among the laboring population of our country? The Fourth of July orators tell us that we have the grandest and most highly favored country under the circuit of the sun. And they are right. And yet in spite of this glorious country there is continual complaint. What is wrong? Some answer tariff, some free trade, some monopolies, some labor unions, some interference with the ballot box, some this and some that. It puts me in mind of a story I once read about a farmer and his hogs. A farmer had a lot of hogs, of a good breed too, which would not fatten on milk. He gave them ever so much milk every day and yet in spite of all

they got poorer continually. He thought those hogs had some new and strange disease of some kind. He made them a subject for an article for an agricultural journal. A veterinary surgeon thought it a very strange thing and determined to look into it. He went and viewed the hogs. They were a sorry looking lot in spite of the milk. He climbed into the hog pen to investigate, and lo the mystery was solved—there was a large crack in the hog trough. If we would merely stop the leakage we could banish hard times in spite of all these ailments about which the politicians harp so much. They are merely indications of disease, they are not the cause of the disease. We must distinguish between industries that are beneficial and profitable to the country and such as are evil and destructive. This country can no more live half drunk and half sober than it could half slave and half free.

What excuse is there for permitting such a deadly business to have free course? We legislate against diseased meats, bogus butter, tramps, thieves, prostitutes, etc. Why not legislate this out of existence? Certainly a state that has the right to defend itself against some enemies has the right to defend itself against every enemy. But says one, If you destroy this industry you destroy the government's greatest source of revenue. Now is it not a pretty state of affairs when a government goes into partnership with the robbers of itself? Why, if the people of the United States used no liquors they could pay this 90,000,000 dollars of revenue and still be better off by 1,700,000,000 of dollars. A committee of liquor dealers once visited Mr. Gladstone to protest against the agitation of the temperance question in Parliament. They said, "If you permit this to go on where will you get your revenue?" Mr. Gladstone straightened up and said, "Gentlemen, do not give yourselves any trouble about the revenue. Give me a sober people and I will raise the revenue."

But there are many who admit all this in reference to the liquor business, but they say, "Its no use, you can't do anything with it, you might just as well leave it alone."

Is it really true that the people of these United States have an evil upon them with which they are afraid to grapple? Since when have the people who arose so grandly to put down the

usurpation of the mother country and to crush the life out of the monster slavery, become such cowards? All that is necessary is for those who love their country to arise and say, This accursed business must stop! And it will stop. It will be a long time before another minority will undertake to rebel against the will of the majority. Impossible? Why with this American people, who have made so many grand achievements, not anything in the line of the bettering of her people ought to be deemed impossible.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THOUGHTS ON WOMAN'S EDUCATION.

By MRS. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, Berlin, Germany.

Controversy as to whether woman's mind is equal to that of man is an idle use of time. Men and women never can be rivals in the spheres of their highest activity, since these are so widely different. Heirs of nineteen Christian centuries, and members of a nation working out some problems the old world never seriously raised, we have but to open our eyes upon what women have brought to pass in the Church, the schools, the mission work, for temperance and other reforms, to be awakened to the vital question, What training makes the most of a woman? In America our pedagogic literature no longer asks whether she is worth the highest cultivation, but whether, far as that has advanced, it is building on the right foundation. Meanwhile the best institutions of learning open to her and the great, practical organizations she is managing are affording women of power a training that will fit them to grapple with this problem of transcendent importance. It is not good for man to be alone God decided, and he made woman to help. He entrusted her with powers that help, it seems,—in a far wider sense than man or woman has dreamed in any age. Man's helper—giving him being, laying the foundations of his character, exerting influence pre- and post-natal that is supreme in his formative years; she is his sister, his cherished ideal in the love of his

youth, his wife, his daughter, his friend. What a spiral of influence winding him round and about from the womb to the tomb, subtle, strong and powerful, a part of it God appointed, a part self-chosen. But one question on earth is more important to a man than what woman shall be, and that is what he is himself.

But as the German Bible expresses it our knowledge is *Stueckwerk*—fragmentary. Our striving is toward completion but how to attain we know only in part. When God finished his human being he called him good. Then came the ravages of sin and made man *Stueckwerk*. How shall we attain completeness? Our topic deals with woman's completeness, an essential to human completeness. How shall the home and the school and the Church build her up body and spirit until she is fit to fulfil the chief end of her being, having knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, "to glorify God and to enjoy him forever?"

Let us seek an outline of the subject in its entirety. It is not because she is to be a housekeeper, or a teacher, or an artist, but because she is to be a woman, that she needs high training of all her faculties, all her powers, and according to the scale of their comparative value. It takes body, soul and spirit under consideration, and the aim is to develop a strong woman harmonious in her powers. The body has a few months the start of the perceptible soul life, is the case and instrument of all its powers, and a weighty factor in human life. Its highest development results in health; commonly that is taken to mean mere painless existence with a certain degree of strength, when not only these but vigor, elasticity, the power of endurance and the joy of life are necessary to its perfection. To attain and preserve it includes more than the wherewithal to feed and clothe the body, so that all its parts may assume due size and proportions; more than the mere chemistry and activity, it also requires the right action of the soul and spirit from which it may receive abuse or benefit. In regard to this so much depends upon woman's knowledge and skill that instruction upon the subject of health should form an important factor in her education. Her care and study here might render important aid in the development and promotion of its science, a great need of the world. We not only need a few women trained as physi-

cians and nurses but we need among women universal education concerning the nature, needs, the use and abuse of the body. And not mere theory but practice—education known by its fruits, evident in their own bodily health and in that of their family.

Again, to keep the subject in its entirety, it must be taught whereunto. The evil world strives to keep women ignorant except as to her bodily advantages. The world as it becomes Christian awakes to the advantages of her soul and spirit.

We find in the soul, intellect, emotion and will. And we find in education the main culture directed to the intellect, or rather to occupying a few faculties of it with external things; while with but slight exceptions the emotions and the will are left to the cultivation of circumstances. Pretty much all effort has run into intellectual culture, and the learned world takes a pause and inquires whether even that is pursued with the best means and the right aims. We heap to ourselves knowledge and when acquired discover that we have not gained the mental power to employ our materials. Knowledge is power; but not unless it is energized and employed. It is the material with which to construct systems if the mind itself is a master-builder. No, knowledge is only means, not power. Cultivation requires and accumulates knowledge as the citizen, money. Alas that both make the fatal mistake of making the means an end! Our schools do not always correct it; we are taught for the sake of the thing learned which is sometimes immaterial, when we ought to be conscious of being trained to acquire power to learn, to perceive, to compare, to judge, to arrange, to remember, to keep the sweep of our entire mental horizon and to extend it. So taught, we should in time gain a comprehensive view of self in its relations, should arrive at the meaning of what God in the beginning called "good."

We also need to know how to study. Where is that taught? It is a pity that so much time must be wasted until the lesson is self-taught. An account of the place each branch used as a discipline occupies in the system of education pursued, is the right of the learner. Even baby life is now being scientifically observed to discover if possible the period when the various

faculties awake. During our school years our educators ought to be cognizant of the expansion, and of the periods of comparative strength, of the reason and memory so as to adapt the scale of studies to the right exercise of these faculties. When we have learned to use our five senses, have attained a certain vocabulary, and have acquired the art of reading, we have the key to all the external world can reveal to us, or men communicate. Throughout our lives we can only go on sharpening our powers of observation, increasing our stock of ideas and becoming more interested in their history through books. Education should stimulate to extend the mental vision far as the eye can read, and to read correctly. The range of our school studies has this in view, but the schools are often slipshod in their methods, besides there is no wise coöperation between the home and the schools, and scholars complete the course without any but the vaguest notion what it was designed to accomplish. Happy the capable school girl who has some Socrates to ply her with questions on all her pursuits from first to last. We are taught the structure of language, the relations of numbers, the surface of the earth, the course of historic events, the life of plants, the order of rock creation, the stars in their relations, the composition of substances around us, their forces and motion, the construction of our bodies and finally what has been observed concerning the mind and the spirit, together with the evidences of the Author and Preserver of these wonders. And it is good so. We need this range through words and figures, over space and among the people of all times, in the fields and down the mines, aloft in the heavens, introducing us to the mystery of gases and forces, to the mechanics of our own wonderful machine, to the mystery of what in us is most subtle of all, so near it takes us longest to get to it, the veritable *ego*. And then at length, sitting at home in the mind, and letting the image of all these wonderful organisms pass slowly through its chamber and afford some hint of the sweep and the structure of the universe a passion will be aroused for "more stately mansions" of the soul, stronger capacities, more ability to discover and meditate upon these "thoughts of God" in his wonderful works.

To apprehend all that the being is made for, and to apprehend correctly, becomes an eager demand according as the clamor of the body is kept under. School years are so important to the woman's education that we anxiously inquire whether the range of studies pursued there is sufficient as director to that end. Is it the best adapted? Sufficient, I should say. We do not want more studies but a better quality of study, more conscious of itself. The world wants in womankind a deeper, more earnest education laid on the foundation of her Maker, one that will stretch her capacity high and deep; more study of what the Lord has made, and less of that in which the devil has had a hand. "A little learning is a dangerous thing" has more than a sportive meaning. Much learning is the antidote. However one can be "ever learning and never coming at the truth." To attain the large aim of the truth, at the close of a course at college woman's education is but just begun; but while pursuing it she ought to receive the keys and a chart of all the range of knowledge open to her, together with the inspiration to continue its investigation throughout life. Satan has a very particular interest in keeping women distracted and petty in the employment of their intervals of duty. Enlargement and strength resist him. Is it not the women receiving most inspiration from Christ who are now rising to higher paths? There are new stirrings toward self-improvement among the women of the Lutheran Church, and they had their origin largely in the missionary societies. Let completeness in herself be woman's aim and that towards which she inspires her contemporaries.

But the very aim at completeness, this width and extent of vision, will induce her to seek out her place in the social organism, to find out the intentions of the Author in endowing women with such capacities and powers, and investing her with such relations. This woman question, however, can not be solved until there is a nearer approach of women to all that they have power to become, and then we shall have reason to hope that they will produce the theory. Involved in that nearer approach is a principle not to be overlooked. The mission of woman is too serious, her part in the world's work too important to let intellectual culture comprise all the training she receives. Let

that become thorough, and broad, and deep, as she has capacity and opportunity; but we must plead for a deeper, more earnest education, one that trains the whole soul, the character. Everywhere as culture increases and education becomes more universal, more attention is being paid to girl's education. But in Europe the higher schools for women make the mistake of placing society as the principal field of action for women and of cultivating too exclusively that side of her nature. In America her educational advantages approach those of her brother, and suffer from the same misapprehension—that education is a thing of the schools and may be completed there. Schools cannot attempt much more than the intellectual training, nevertheless the various colleges for women seem to stamp their graduates with an individual type as to maturity and character. The spirit of Mary Lyon still breathes in the daughters of Mt. Holyoke and in the institutions founded on the same plan.

The great Leibnitz made a valuable division of the subject when he was required to draw up a project of education for a prince. He desired it to include three grades; the necessary, the useful, and the ornamental. Under the head of the necessary he aimed at the qualities of the disposition, uprightness, courage, judgment, as well as other culture. The upright man he characterizes as pious, just and philanthropic; the courageous as one of heart, not easily shaken, but maintaining his freedom whatever befalls; a man of judgment will think and speak freely upon every kind of subject and not be dazzled by appearances; a man of culture will observe what is respectable, avoid all that gives offense without which characteristic he would not be fit to appear in the society of his peers. The wise man laid the greatest stress on the cultivation of the spirit, placing even for a prince the study of statesmanship and the military art in the second, or useful grade. In his third grade of completeness, he included enlightenment on history, geography, genealogy, law, theology, agriculture, mathematics, the fine arts, the secrets of nature as revealed in chemistry, medicine, in fact in every kind of profession. "For," he said, "a prince has much leisure to devote to enjoyment, and it is better he should take pleasure in these beautiful kinds of enjoyment that are realities

to human life than in things that are frivolous, not to say, shameful." To his mind the great benefit of wealth was the ability to gain time through the help of others. And time was to him the most precious thing in the world, properly the life.

His scheme of education for the gifted princess Sophie Charlotte of Hanover, and her daughter, the first queen of Prussia, included a very careful training in philosophy, a pursuit in which they took the keenest delight.

What requirements should we call necessary to the pefection of woman, needed whether other training is included or not? Needed all the more because it is growing easier every day to make a certain amount of social display, but becoming harder and harder for people in whatever circumstances to do well by their children. We want, as the result of training, women who are noble, strong, independent, industrious, with character and understanding harmoniously cultivated, the personality developed to its highest intensity. The root of all human culture is religion; we want its life to pervade all its branches. In many lives there is a lack of unity, and the secret may be traced to its many gods. Teach girls to behold what is magnificent and great in the world, but above all do not neglect to also make them see the good. In spite of many of the classics, in spite of modern literature and life let them see that love and humility are more exalted than qualities whose glitter is more apparent to the uncultivated eye.

By their fruits ye shall know them. Look at educated women and see whether the results are what they should be, in what respects they are models, or a warning. Consider them not only as individuals, but relative to their homes, what kind of daughters, sisters, wives, mothers they are, relative to society, to their fatherland, to entire humanity. Lives contribute proof whether their training is being directed according to right principles, and whether it has been brought to a satisfactory degree. Returning to the many-sided philosopher whose counsel was sought on all subjects, I think what he says concerning princes applies in kind to what we want in woman. "In any case I prefer an old Duke Earnest of Gotha, who devoted himself to the

administration and care of his state, which he found in a ruinous condition as the result of long wars, and which by means of industry he restored to prosperity; who kept piety and righteousness foremost in mind—I say, such a prince I prefer to the most accomplished ruler in the world, even if he did understand all sciences, and all arts; were master of all languages; had adopted the fine manners of the foreigners; and shone in brilliant conversation, but was negligent in attending to business and the welfare of those entrusted to his care; and who for the sake of not having his amusements disturbed stuffed his ears that he might not hear the cry of the wretched, or be moved by the reproaches of his people or the rebuke of his family, accordingly letting his state go into decline. A great king has furnished a lamentable example."

No matter what relation a woman may sustain from daughter to mother, to contribute to the family welfare becomes an early trust; and it is only in size and not in degree that the family and its concerns can be accounted small as compared with the affairs of the state. The powerful influence wielded by women over the race in infancy, over the female part of it through their lives, over the male part especially during youth does not decrease with the progress of the times. Complications keep the husband and father more busy, more away from home, and the mother has more responsibility and influence to wield than ever before. The Jesuits understand the importance of her sphere, they try to usurp it. It urges the question as to the qualities requiring training in the regent of a family.

For these necessary elements of education the school cannot be the principal educator, the home is the most important of all, and the church its indispensable ally. At the head of the attainments worthy of education I would put love. Love developed into a habit of general benevolence; the love that is happy in the bliss of others, or that makes the bliss of another one's own. Applied to God as an object love is the perfection of piety. Suvern, of the Prussian ministry, told the young men whom the government was sending to Pestalozzi, at Yverton, that the object of their mission was "not to acquire the externality of Pestalozzi's method, that was but a weak exhalation,

or precipitate, of his spirit and idea; nor to acquire his skill in teaching, but just that they might warm themselves by the holy fire glowing in the bosom of that man of power and love." Pestalozzi's power lay in the purity and nobility of his personality and his love for humanity, he was wholly free from vanity or selfishness even among the lowest; and herein all his efforts had their origin.

The relation of the sexes demands only two fundamental conditions: that women be matured and trained to true womanliness, and men to true manliness. Christianity knows only a qualitative, no quantitative sexual difference, a difference of equally privileged gifts. Woman needs the courage Socrates defines as "a wise strength of mind, the intelligent and reasonable fortitude which foresees coming evil and can calculate the consequences of personal acts." She also needs justice, magnanimity, love of honor, generosity, and will-power. To obtain the latter there is a hint in the following fact: deeds have the inclination to reproduce themselves and to produce habits or conditions of the will. Therefore one becomes just, magnanimous by being occupied with thoughts and feelings that enlarge and elevate the soul, generous, by large dealing. Self-discipline should be aimed at in education and is attained by attention to order, regularity, duty, right, justice, and love towards others! The strength of the power which we term will depends mainly on the constancy with which it is exercised, upon its being habitually maintained. Women need to attain confidence, independence. How much time is lost in a thousand bagatelles for want of independence of the prejudices and the fashions of her environment. It is essential to thrift of her time, her money, her strength. Industry, skill, and economy are necessary if well-being is to abound. I would also add concentration, or attention; it is that on which memory depends, correctness of knowledge and thought, and that discretion of manner without which we cannot imagine a true woman. There are enough sorrows in life without multiplying them, hence the cultivation of cheerfulness must be appended to this list. To neglect cultivating the disposition would thwart the aim of woman's happiness and of those around her. One of Goethe's characters says,

"There is one thing that humanity does not bring into the world, but one on which everything depends in order that a human being may become a human being in every respect, and that is reverence. Plato's complaint fits into our times and the occasion of it should find correction at the fountain head. He said, "We no longer listen with respectful silence to superior interests, but one and all are become accomplished critics, and every one knows everything. Awe and reverence have gone for ever, and there is a shameless disregard for authority whether of parents, or rulers, or elders." Recognition of authority and how to exercise it are specially important in the system of woman's education; authority of parents over children, elder over younger, mistress over servant. Harmony and obedience among the subjects of a family are necessary to its best welfare. Excess of freedom is a mischief. Wholesome law must be felt. Subordination and obedience are a necessary discipline towards attaining full spiritual stature. We need to observe and to exact it. The highest gratitude for the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free will be manifest in our revering the powers set over us by God's Word. A number of the qualities here mentioned were beautifully exemplified in the mother of two men now eminent in the Christian ministry of Germany, the court preacher Emil Frommel and his brother Max. She had been asked for the secret of her eminent success in training her boys, and modestly replied that she was not aware of having employed any other than "watching how God made good her deficiencies in training." But in one of his books, the court preacher describes in his mother several characteristics that must have been as necessary to the development of her children as this passive trust. He says: "There were two things in which she was inexorable, unconditional truth and unconditional obedience. There was no contradicting or raising opposition in her presence, and there was nothing she hated as she did a lie. She united a lofty ideal purpose with a sharp moral judgment—woe to him who should indulge in rude or vulgar words in her presence! There was something republican in her fiery nature and she recognized only one authority, but to that she bowed herself. Never was a truer heart. What she recognized as true in her conscience she

fought through with all energy despite every obstacle. Many a time her punishment which was swift to descend upon an offender fell upon the wrong boy, but always then her keen sense of justice led her to seek pardon of the victim, which, because of her spirit of fairness, was speedily obtained. She knew no fear of man. And so it was that she nurtured and steeled in us respect for authority, and at the same time defiance for the merely arbitrary, hatred for all that is vulgar and ignoble, independence of will—in a word she gave us character. Father used to say, ‘Children, if you amount to anything it is your mother you have to thank for it.’” The world needs women who will feel all their duties and have skill in fulfilling them; needs their advantages of disposition, their understanding, their practical adaptability, their energy of feeling and will, and their tact in the treatment of all those under their charge, as in all social relations. These are all made more efficient by training and of that there is sore need. Take for instance the great cry of inefficient servants; it is an evidence of inefficiency in training and treating serving people. There are other factors, but the principal one is to be laid at the door of the housewives. Whence shall any good, or elevation, come to young servants if not from their employers? The desired fruit must be rightly cultivated. As we behold, schools have little opportunity for the general culture of morals and feeling; for this purpose they are far from being well enough planned and advanced; besides, the course of education there is too soon broken off. What these leave undone wise women ought to be ready to take up and complete, both, for young mistresses and servants. There is responsibility for something more than simply getting the required labor out of completely inexperienced and easily befooled young domestics. Despite socialism, labor unions, and the manifold outside interferences will women rise to this question? Strange that the whole complicated subject of woman's relations to people, outside of certain superficial directions for display in society, is so neglected in instruction. It is not the problem for men, hence the women of eminent gifts in this line and of special experience have the responsibility laid on them for the discovery of its principles and their being inculcated; let them

impart their methods and their spirit. Because theirs is bread labor, governesses, kindergardeners and teachers seek skill and training; ought not mothers also to seek models among mothers? When the distinction between the important and unimportant shall be kept in mind it will work great reform in the course of pursuits. That will excite carefulness to seek instruction wherever special responsibility is laid, and will shape woman's education to herself, her own higher needs. Throughout girlhood she will seek all that fits her to become the highest human being, at the same time she will be growing aware of her provinces and taking kindly to the education that will fit her to be a sovereign there, to her own credit and the good of humanity. As enlightenment proceeds perhaps some of the studies women now pursue may be dropped, for in their own good time new and more important ones ought to take their place. In all matters pertaining to definite perceptions of the right relations of individuals, to control of persons, Germany has an advantage. Here, where nearly every man is a trained soldier, recognition of authority, unhesitating obedience, and military courtesy, are so general as to be a constant object lesson whose influence permeates all grades of the people. Children and those under authority submit with a better grace where they see such examples of obedience and deference in their superiors. Among the more cultivated classes insubordination is so quickly nipped in the bud as to be a rare spectacle. Laws regulating the non-essentials of life, so that these can be speedily disposed of, create time for the important things. Every German woman of position and education is expected to be a thorough, consistent disciplinarian, even in society. A hostess will not spare rank, man nor maiden, when anything due to her, or her guests, is forgotten, though the reminder usually comes in words selected by the gentlest tact, but always sufficiently plain. Frequently, young girls who have completed their school studies and a course under their own mothers are sent to spend months in assisting ladies eminent in directing their own households and society, that they may thoroughly attain the art of management of an establishment.

A new country like ours where wealth is so rapidly accumu-

lated affords great advantages to the children above their parents. They become more than the heirs of an added age. Right here a partial education may produce results to be deplored. If with the superior intellectual culture there is no harmonious culture of the heart, it may produce the revolting spectacle of children manifesting impatience and chagrin when they ought to show gratitude, and haughtiness where they ought to yield honor and reverence. A writer in a German journal says, "Children are taught too much and trained too little, they learn so much they ought not, so little of what is necessary to life. A boy of capacity may acquire sufficient knowledge to become an eminent minister; but not the moral strength to withdraw calmly and retire into private life. Youth is taught to become rich, but who teaches the more difficult art of doing without riches, to be satisfied with little and still to rejoice in his existence? Every art is taught which is to result in making one's fortunes, but how is it with the art of bearing misfortune nobly when it comes. In a word we are not trained in the art of living. We are directed to the religious teacher, who does all that one can reasonably expect when he impresses religious teaching on the memory and causes it to be intellectually grasped. But drill in the moral laws is a matter for the home training only; the home should go hand in hand with the school, further its activity and support, but how seldom is this the case! In practical matters *to know* is nothing, but *to be able to do* is everything. \* \* We are rich in great scholars, critics, and officers, but we are so poor in great characters." If the home is to teach these most necessary things, who in the home is to do it? Frommel's testimony is repeated by most great men—they have their mother to thank for what they amount to. O the teaching a woman needs for the important offices she holds in life; the pity that so many well considered marriages become unfortunate because young wives are not capable of performing their duties as they would certainly wish, and all simply for the reason that they are ignorant and cannot adapt themselves, and not because they are badly disposed! The new generations of girl scholars coming fresh from our colleges have a lofty mission in a field where thoughtful, learned men have been expending their best

energies and are not yet content with what they have produced. The helpmeet for man is needed also in the search after the laws of nature in humanity and education; thought from her stand-point has already been a leavening power. Many of the reforms we are enjoying to-day, and others now occupying gifted men and women, were first suggested by Mary Wollstonecraft, a century ago. A soul conscious of unused powers needs to feel that it occupies a place of grave importance to stimulate it to its best. Much more progress might have been made in the right direction if woman had not been depreciated until she came to think derogatorily of her own powers. So long as she retains this feeling there will be a tendency to think meanly of the special duties assigned to her as to those belonging to an inferior being, and requiring only limited powers and strength to perform them. Surely she must soon arrive at the discovery that her sphere develops the best gifts of a human being, and would enlarge the highest powers.

Special work has opened for educated women, and they have an evident call to organize departments of labor helping to solve the social problems now agitating the nations, and sweeping through their own doors. Bearing arms for their country seems rarely in the world's history to have been woman's mission, but there are foes even more dangerous to a nation than having a Napoleon for a neighbor. The woman warfare "For God and home and native land" that had its origin in that strange outpouring of the Holy Spirit manifest in the Woman's Crusade now enlists the largest organization of women that ever was seen, is generated by the wonderful Frances Willard, and has been raging for fourteen years. Who suffer the most desperate wrongs from the liquor interests? No wonder with such a foe threatening the home on every side, that women seek to obtain every weapon it would be right for her to wield. Woman's mission is a home mission preëminently. She creates, preserves, and helps to defend, the home. But home has a wider meaning than four walls, or a narrow heart, can compass, and woman is responsible for purity and wholesomeness throughout its domain. Hand to hand conflict with the saloon, and with social impurity, has taught the W. C. T. U. the importance of its educational

work. Considering what little children are, fresh from the hand of God, what they might become if only men and women were wise enough to take proper care of them, our educated women are realizing with a satisfaction never felt before that to make them and their education the great study, whether as mothers, teachers, friends, or trainers, is a great and lofty occupation for their lives. The general dissatisfaction and criticism concerning the curriculum in high schools and universities arouses the query whether there are not departments of knowledge awaiting a woman's brain to classify and construct. When women have learned what men can teach, can they not leave off trying to walk in their footsteps and following their patterns? The highest development of womanhood will help the highest development of manhood most. Learning to think and feel after the truth occasions the question whether there are not realities in life which God wants women to reduce to a system. There is so much confusion in social and domestic affairs. Perhaps it must remain so until women give up trying to think men's thoughts in a manly way; come to themselves, are at home in their own minds and characters, and then from the highest cultivable woman's stand-point marry their woman's thoughts and deeds to man's for the increase and multiplying of wisdom, goodness and happiness in the world. If through observation it can be established what forces and powers develop in the first years of life this will add great importance to woman's mission. There is need of an Aristotle among women; work ready to hand would be a theory of woman's social relations, a psychology for women, that whole neglected subject of the emotions outside of aesthetics, and work on ethics. The catechism states the aim of training to be "That they may do their duty in that state of life to which it hath pleased God to call them." Let girls have equal advantages with their brothers, and behold in the result God's theory concerning them; it will be manifest in what they will be able to make of themselves.

The useful, the ornamental, and the necessary, in education interlace according to the object of their attainment. What may be simply an accomplishment to the private student may

be an essential to one destined to earn her bread. Merely filling the memory with knowledge and sharpening the understanding, useful, necessary as it is, often shows as a result a numbing not only of the immediate feeling and of the judgment concerning the right, but also of the impulse and of the natural energy; at the same time this half-education imparts the supposition that it must have produced the capacity to judge of everything, often leading to making infinite individual demands that are opposed to the great moral order. It was in consideration of this deplorable result that so much stress has been laid on that which develops the will and the ethical powers of the soul, and on such direction of training as will fit for some definite, practical pursuit. At the same time, we have seen that the sort of work for women demands also the highest powers of intellect brought to the highest working capacity by the best training. Looking along history what a difference it has made who were the teachers; where were Plato without Socrates, or Aristotle without Plato, or Alexander the Great without Aristotle?

Among mental disciplines one of the most instructive, broadening, and inspiring, is the study of history if pursued with reference to its general outlines, from its beginning to the present, dividing the subject according to its natural development to be afterwards filled in with more complete and detailed accounts as opportunity offers. How it helps in every study if you know its history! The memory may not retain all details, but certain ideas and impressions remain, calculated to awaken others in case of need, and at least render the mind susceptible to all that offers itself on that subject. Let the scope be the world's history from Egypt to the present, even if concerning it much more may never be learned than is offered in "The History Primers" edited by J. R. Green. System in all study keeps before the mind the totality of a subject, it leads to the attaining of its principles and the learner is kept conscious of what she does not know on that subject, of itself valuable information and an incentive to further investigations. To return to history in general, there is a famous fresco in the old museum in Berlin which suggests a method that may be a valuable aid to the memory in matters of historic detail. It is Kaulbach's "Era of the Refor-

mation" and it represents, and groups in appropriate place, all who were most distinguished in that age in the several departments that affected culture. Luther is the central figure, and near him are his great Wittenberg colleagues distributing the Lord's Supper. Behind, occupying a gallery above, are the precursors of the reformation, Wickliffe, Huss, Savonarola, Waldus, and others; to the left, in a niche, are the great artists of the time, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Leonardo di Vinci, and Dürer; nailed to a column a specimen sheet is Gutenberg, the inventor of printing; standing below, are Erasmus, and other eminent scholars; seated to the left, at the foot of the picture, are the great authors of the age, Shakespeare, Dante, Cervantes, and several German authors, with Hans Sachs humbly occupying a seat on the floor. Noted warriors are here, Ulrich von Hutten, Franz von Sickingen; on the right hand, at the base, stands Christopher Columbus beside a globe, explaining to the famous geographers and explorers what astonishes them visibly; above in the right niche, are the great astronomers, Copernicus with his map of the heavens, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Galileo; grouped beside the column there stands Queen Elizabeth, the greatest monarch of her times, and grouped about her, her brilliant court. Designing similar pictures mentally of all the great and admirable in any age, keeping trace of their relation to the general progress, and of nation to nation and to the world's history, will thus map out indications of all that is most worth knowing that has transpired on the globe.

An eminent astronomer said that the pursuit of his science enabled him "to think the thoughts of God." In all education there is one source of revelation greatly neglected, the scientific study of God as revealed in the human being. The comparative value of Greek and the higher mathematics to the more serious study of philosophy as a discipline should be gravely considered. It would be profitable to devote much more attention to logic, psychology and ethics. Here again the subject should be presented in its entirety so far as philosophy has been developed, a comprehensive Introduction to the Study of Philosophy should form the stepping stone. But to gather materials of thought without growing in power of expression would

be to thwart one of the objects of scholarship. Mastery of at least one's own language with its best literature is indispensable to a complete education. The study of Latin is of such value in the comprehension of English, and in acquiring most modern tongues, that conscientious study of it is great gain. I would have women know much; it is the way to the realization of how little she knows or her brothers can attain; it is the way to the modesty, humility, and thoroughness, needed to help allay this world's confusion and bring it to an appreciation of the worthiest and best, the one thing needful.

The place and importance of the fine arts in the development of our powers may well make us hesitate to place them wholly in the category of the ornamental in education. Plato wanted music included in the system of education, simple, ennobling music chanting the noblest thoughts. Bach, Haydn, Beethoven, Händel, and Mendelssohn, have opened new avenues of the soul for the awakening and the expression of the noble and beautiful in feeling. As the study of music is generally pursued it is not a means of intellectual culture, and often its most skilful expression is prostituted to other than high moral uses. But there is an immense range in musical composition, some of it sin cannot touch, it has been consecrated; and this, largely the grandest and the best, should be commended to the student. Germany has a few musical schools devoted to this class of compositions, and to church music. Such should also find a home in America. Joachim was once directing a chorus which was rehearsing the vocal part of the ninth symphony, and I heard him say, "When you want to interpret Beethoven you need to bring a collected mind and heart. You cannot turn from your châtrer and reveal what the master had in his soul." The mission of music is so soothing, inspiring, and uplifting that all who have an opportunity to learn to sing, or play, *musically*, have a call to diffuse its sweet spirit.

We have only to observe a woman in whom the aesthetic feelings lie dormant to wish that she would respond to "Whatsoever things are lovely \* \* think on these things." The love of beauty is something inherent in woman; for her contentment and self-respect let her not violate it. Let her be

taught which beauty is highest in degree, as well as in kind,—cultivate in all essentials her taste. Charm of manner, purity and beauty of speech, are all 'to be thought of.' Paul's idea of things lovely ascended the gamut, culminating in the beauty of holiness. To please and to charm is no unimportant aim of cultivation if it is made an end of becoming the means of a high calling, to reveal the spirit of Him who grew in favor with God and man every day, the One altogether lovely.

---

#### ARTICLE VIII.

##### MIDLAND COLLEGE — THE GROUND OF ITS CLAIM.\*

By M. RHODES, D. D., Pres. *pro tem.*

"In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.—Col. 2 : 3.

I place this comprehensive utterance of Holy Scripture at the beginning of my remarks more as a fitting motto than as a text, for what I shall say may be styled an address rather than a sermon. At the same time I regard it as eminently appropriate, for I profoundly believe that it contains the fundamental principle upon which alone the Christian college can be reared and maintained. In establishing Midland College upon a proper basis, and with a promise of success about which there can be no question, the very first thing to be done is to lift the crown to His head who is the source of all wisdom. These words do not furnish us with a figure, but they distinctly announce a most important fact. The treasures of that wisdom and knowledge which are adequate to the highest needs of men and nations, and which are worthy of your attention and mine, are hidden in Christ,—not from us, but for us. It is singular enough and at once a motive and an encouragement for all engaged in this good work that history bears ample testimony to the truth of this statement, as it stands related to the cause of proper education. Our great country is not cursed, neither is our wonder-

\* An Address delivered in Atchison, Kansas, in the Presbyterian Church, on Lord's Day evening, Sept. 11, 1887.

ful civilization hampered nor hindered by those men in the high places of church and state, as well as in the lower spheres of human life, the roots of whose knowledge strike deep in the fathomless wisdom of the Son of God, and whose spirit and aim seek to exalt him as the one rightful king over all. I deem this intimation of the trend of my remarks as the more important not only because this is the first public utterance in behalf of the institution we are about to establish in this city, but because of the marked tendency in this secular age of ours to divorce religion and higher education. This suggests one of the most vital questions now challenging the attention of thoughtful men—the question as to whether education shall be purely secular, and so, partial and injurious; or whether it shall be moral and religious as well, and so, complete and beneficial. Quite more than is realized, I fear, the destiny of the rising generation, and of this great country of ours depends upon the right solution of this mighty problem. We want wisdom and knowledge of the highest type, wisdom and knowledge the most varied and helpful in all the pursuits and walks of life, and if we will have that which will serve best, and result in the largest return to ourselves and others, there could be no greater mistake than to ignore the Fountain-Head. Touch the subject of education where you please, and apply it as you may, it can only achieve the best and the most when it has regard to Him "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." But in the eager exciting search, this is just what the secularist would have us ignore. His theory is that we are to look for the gold, but elsewhere than in the mine. His view is wholly inconsistent, it is hampered with both limitation and peril, and however fair it may seem, the result in the end will be found to be worse than failure.

It is not my purpose now, however, to enter into any elaborate discussion of the relation of all useful knowledge to that which the Church has ever rightfully regarded as supreme, nor to point out the distinction between the secular and Christian in education, except as they may incidentally occur in what I shall say. The time will come as we advance for the notice of these and kindred topics, for this subject of education is one of vast

proportions and one which is deserving of the most careful attention of the three great factors in our civilization, namely, the Home, the Church, and the State. For the present, however, it will be fitting and enough that I present some of the grounds upon which Midland College may lay claim to the helpful interest and patronage of the city and State in which it is located. An institution like that in whose behalf we have met to-night, and which you have yourselves invited with eager interest and very commendable generosity, must not only have a reason for its existence, but a substantial ground of appeal as well. This much you have a right to expect, and this much we hold to be peculiar to the college that is distinctively Christian.

Before I advance to the points I desire to emphasize, it would seem fitting to say a word respecting the Church under whose auspices this institution is founded, and by which it will be controlled. I am aware that as a mere matter of information it need not be said in a presence like this, that the Lutheran Church is an educating Church, but it may be said as a testimony to the great cause represented here to-night, and as some token of what may be expected in the time to come. More I am sure than is generally known the ministry and the educators of universal Christendom are indebted to the universities of the fatherland which bear her name. The Lutheran Church both in this country and in Europe has always recognized this high function as no small part of her mission. The right sort of learning was not only one of the agencies in the achievement of the great Reformation, but also one of its most effective results. With the liberation of conscience came the emancipation of intellect; when the shackles of ignorance and superstition were struck from the soul, the mind asserted itself, and began that untrammeled acquaintance of useful knowledge whose brilliant march has come to be one of the wonders of the ages. The Reformation not only declared that Galileo was right, but that henceforth the brain of Galileo should be free to discover and demonstrate truth in every sphere no matter what doctrines of men it overturned. The Church we have the honor to represent comes with no boast nor exclusive claim, but she believes that light is liberty, and that no cloud should be permitted to

keep it from the humblest child ; she believes that truth is to be sought in every sphere and that it is the heritage of the race, as free as the beams that fall from the sun, or as the mountain spring that leaps over the cheek of the rock ; she believes that if God does not need our learning, he can as little get on with our ignorance, and that the greater the intellectual resources, if properly applied, the greater the results for good, both to the individual and to the community. I own with gladness and gratitude that the other communions assembled here to-night hold these views in common with us, and their own efforts in behalf of Christian education in this land furnish ample testimony to their fidelity and success in the great cause. What I have said I have said with conviction, and because I feel that it is quite as due to you on this occasion as it is appropriate in this address.

What now are some of the grounds on which Midland College proposes to commend itself to the sympathy and patronage of this city and community ?

First, history bears ample testimony to the fact that such an institution is of greatest value to the community and State in which it is located. Midland College has as yet no history to furnish testimony to its worth, nor will gratuitous adverse prophecy and unbelief, ever help it to any such history, but there are numerous other like institutions, commenced under far less favorable auspices, whose achievements enable us to speak with intelligent conviction. Besides, this institution is by no means a venture ; it represents principles true and tried, that in themselves warrant success, and it has an aim uplifted, and underneath which are the Everlasting Arms. There is much in a right beginning, and in this we have endeavored to be prayerfully vigilant, and we would be treacherous to our faith in God, if we expected little instead of much. I affirm that such an institution is of incalculable value to the community and State to which it belongs. Take the smallest Christian colleges, those that must struggle to survive, and I give it as my belief based on stubborn facts, that they are very fountains of blessing to the communities that possess them.

In this secular age many men are wont only to look for suc-

cess on the surface. They see it only in that which can be piled up, counted and insured from the flames. It is strange, but true, that the superficial and the perishable make most impression upon the minds of many; they forget that the greatest and most imperishable forces for good are concealed and silent. The thought may be applied with great force to the Christian College. To those of you who look below where the dust gathers, it will be seen by and by, that in Midland College you built better than you knew.

The college furnishes useful public men to the state. And just this the Christian college should do, for the state is the institution of God. "It is an ordinance of the King of kings, established for high political and moral purposes; and it claims, under the limitations of rectitude, supreme allegiance and universal homage." To give to the state men worthy of the responsibilities the state demands and the distinctions it confers, is at once one of the highest duties and best testimonies to the worth of the Christian College.

It does this *by strengthening and enlightening the mind*. With ever expanding range it imparts knowledge, and provides for all the useful vocations of life men who have not only been taught to know, but to apply wisely and well what they know. There is not a calling of human life that is not more or less hampered by lack of knowledge, and the perplexity that comes to men in business and enterprise, and the hardship and misery that wear and waste great multitudes of people, are due very largely to the incompetence and utter lack of aptitude which come of ignorance.

An institution with a just conception of the possibilities of the human mind, and with the very highest aim of human life as an impulse, that puts light in the place of such darkness, is a blessing to the state that can never be estimated by any material value. Mark, what I emphasize, that it is the function of the Christian college, over against the secular, to conceive rightly of the possibilities of the intellect, and of the loftiest aim of life, and it is because of this, that the Christian college must stand preëminent in its worth to the state. But the college

builds character as well as illumines the mind. Surely, to mere culture there is limitation; human wisdom and salvation are a long way apart, yet there is something in it, especially when imparted with such an end in view, that refines, that is conducive to manliness, self-reliance, self-respect, and self-restraint, elements of character, you will admit, most essential to proper citizenship, and to any position of trust. There is an atmosphere in college life, especially if the college be Christian, that follows the student, like those hallowed memories of home, which to some of us are as the angels of God.

But keeping our thought on the worth of such an institution to the state, there is undoubtedly that in a collegiate education which fosters the true spirit of liberty. The mind is brought into contact with the master spirits of antiquity, and these for the most part have been champions for freedom. Let a young man stand in the right place and face toward the right goal, and the inflow of knowledge will open his soul to the great truths and laws of the universe, and he will acquire that amethyst of human character—I mean *reverence*, and at once he will rise to a stirring conviction of the dignity of his nature, and the great possibilities of life. In every battle for liberty, whether in the wrestle for knowledge, the advancement of enterprise and invention, in the legislative hall or on the field of carnage, the college man has stood in the front rank and wrought well.

More than is generally supposed, and more than is known by those who fling contemptuous ridicule on colleges and college men, the college is represented in the high places of state, and in all the prominent vocations of life.

Here is a statement taken from official records, which happily fell into my hands while preparing this address, showing most conclusively the advantage of a college education to the aspirant for the high places of trust in the state.

Of the Presidents of the United States 65 per cent. have been graduates. Of Vice Presidents 50 per cent. Speakers of the House of Representatives 61 per cent. Members of the United States Senate 46 per cent. Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, 73 per cent. Chief Justices, 83 per cent. Cabinet officers, 54 per cent. The general average of these is 59 per cent.

Add to these those who have left college before graduating, and it is estimated that college-bred men occupy fully 75 per cent. of the places of honor and trust in the government. The same advantage in favor of a collegiate education would appear were we to examine all the prominent professions and positions in human life. Midland College has yet to make out her catalogue of eminent public service; but we are hopeful and believe that this institution in due time will produce an honorable proportion of manly and capable men in the executive, legislative and judicial departments, and in all the public professions of human life, and of women not a few, whose names will not stand second in the high places to which God is calling the daughters of the land to-day.

Such an institution is of great value to the state because of the healthful influence it must exert on the schools and other benevolent institutions supported by the state. The Church not only recognizes the right, but also the duty of the state to educate. Being itself a divine institution, for "the powers that be are ordained of God"—the state is bound to do what will promote the public good. The state has its poor-houses, and hospitals, its prisons and reformatories, its army and navy, but the institutions that bless the commonwealth, and conserve her liberties and prosperity, are her colleges, academies and common schools, along with her churches. Every man knows that if ignorance could be banished from our land, a very large amount of the pauperism and crime that waste our resources would go with it. Upon all those institutions which the state has established and maintains for the public good, the Christian college exerts a beneficial influence, and in this day, unquestionably, there is need of it, for not a few, to whom parents commit their children to be educated, scorn the thought with which I began this address. This in my judgment is both to ignore the true origin and high purpose of the state. It is wholly unpatriotic and inconsistent with every true principle of citizenship. The Christian college freed from narrowness and bigotry occupies higher ground, it is unhampered by such hurtful inconsistency; it looks to the pupil's highest well-being for his own sake, and for the sake of the position he is to fill; it contemplates the elevation

of the lowest and of the poorest, and comes to favor and supplement every means the state has adopted for such an end. The salutary influence of the Christian college pervades society, it gives tone and right direction to public opinion, and by the very principles on which it is founded, and the lofty purpose at which it constantly aims, it is always a reliable testimony on the side of public virtue and morality.

But especially, I hold, does the Christian college sustain a helpful relation to our common and select schools. Besides furnishing a large number of competent teachers, such an institution imparts a worthy ambition, and supplies enlarged opportunities to the pupil, without which not a few would be limited, if they did not fail altogether in their life-mission. These different schools, distinctive in the manner in which they vary, are reciprocal, the one helps the other, we need all of them, but every thoughtful man will see how free from those injurious influences which the state finds it difficult always to guard against, the Christian college is, and hence its preëminent value as an educator. There is no aspect of the case, which if fairly considered, will not discover the very great advantage of the Christian college to the community and state. I fear the people of this already great State of Kansas little realize the part they are to play in the future of this country through these educational institutions. When I look down upon the youth and realize how they are to be moulded by those who educate them, the question to me is a momentous one, and I thank God for any institution of learning that will underlay and engird itself with such a principle and purpose as are suggested in the word with which I began. I come not with pretense of flattery when I affirm that those of you who have had any part in this commendable undertaking, will not have occasion to blush for your place in the history of Midland College when it shall be written. Midland College, it will be seen is a good and grand gift to a generous city and a great State, better than the regalia of power, better than the trophies of war, better than the achievements of enterprise or all material treasure, or any monument of human ambition.

Secondly—Midland College will aim to challenge your sympathy and patronage on the ground of *thoroughness*.

I count it a good omen that we have come upon a time when there is a manifest weariness of pretense. The day for the merely ornamental and superficial in education is passed. The college henceforth is not to be judged by the number of its students, but by the work it does. Life is becoming more and more real; every great force in our civilization is responding to a general demand for the practical and the useful. This is no day for sham. More than ever education is to be acquired in order that head, hands and heart may be fitted to the world we are in, and the life we are living. This is just as it should be. It will rightfully be the high aim of Midland College to do thorough work. We have no greater desire than that this institution shall have a worthy witness in every pupil it graduates. A college to do its work must be possessed of adequate facilities; it must have a corps of competent instructors, each man as nearly as possible a master in his department. In an eminent sense its faculty must illustrate manhood, represent learning, and possess conscientious skill to impart it.

But in such a statement I would have you bear two things in mind. The faculty and appliances of a college may be the best, but it requires more than this to do thorough work. The parents, the people, the pupils, the Church has much to do with it. There is no place where it is more difficult to make bricks without straw than in a school of higher education. There is no invention yet that will enable a college professor to put brains where there are none, and if the child has never been taught subordination and application in the home, it will be very difficult to secure these in the college when the child becomes a student. A man may be very skilled in touching the keys of an instrument, but what of it if the instrument furnishes nothing? We must not look for the unreasonable, especially while we ourselves withhold the reasonable. I grant you, you have a right to demand and expect thorough work, but keep the mutual conditions in mind.

Remember also that a school like that which we are about to establish in this city, must not be expected to leap into mastery

at one bound. A college is never born full grown. To bring Midland College to the ideal we have set for it will require a large outlay, the labor, and patience and accumulation of years. The full equipment for Midland College will come,—come as it is wise it should—gradually. Princeton, now one of the first institutions in the land, began with no building, no endowment, no professors, no permanent site, and with only 20 students. Its first graduating class numbered but six. Since then, by that gradual growth, for which we shall labor and pray for our Midland, see what God hath wrought.

Let me indicate briefly something of what we mean by thoroughness. In our view, education contemplates not a part, but the whole man. The time has passed, I am glad to believe, when in a thorough education, there shall be no regard for the *physical*. If man has a mind so has he a body; it will avail little that the intellect is brilliant, if the body be enfeebled. It is far from lost labor to teach young men and young women to walk erect as God made them, to make them familiar with the laws of nature, and to hold up in very clear light the certain penalty that follows their violation, to recognize their distinction over lower creation, and their solemn duty to show that human life is not a waste and an indulgence, but a resonant psalm, an inspiration of God that should fill us with gratitude and high hope, and a sublime opportunity to be used for the highest ends; to teach them the peril of all pernicious habits to the physical constitution, and the holy dignity God has conferred upon the human body, not only in its shapeliness and beauty, but in that he has been pleased to make it the temple of the Holy Ghost. Admirably adapted, I think, is the location of Midland College, with its elevated site, its large campus, and splendid view of valley and hill and river all about, to conduce to health. From its walls we shall hope to send out hosts of young men and women, not wilted like leaves in autumn, but fresh and strong like flowers in spring-time, ready for life's battle, and answering to an adage too often forgotten in procuring an education—*Mens sana in corpore sano*—A sound mind in a sound body.

The next thing contemplated in thoroughness is a disciplined

mind. This means more than cramming, getting through, or memorizing. It means for the mind what the discipline of the athlete means for muscle. It means vigor, robustness of intellect to grapple with the difficult, far more this, than so much knowing in a particular branch. It means what never comes of incompetence in the teacher, and indolence in the pupil. It means the power of concentration, the ability to keep our way, until we have gotten through some particular labyrinth of knowledge. It means not only the ability to see the gold in the quartz, but also the power to break the rock, get the precious metal out and put it into current coin. Students never come to such thoroughness by light reading, but by severe patient application, helped wisely by those who have been over the way before them. Midland College will spare no pains to send out young men and young women, not painted on the outside, but each possessing the gift of a disciplined mind, for it is the disciplined mind that is to do the world's great work in the time to come.

But thoroughness consists in more than mastering the textbook. Man has more than a physical and a mental part. No system of education, nor effort to attain it, is worthy to be called thorough that neglects the moral and spiritual. Just here, as we shall see, all purely secular education is put at serious disadvantage. Undoubtedly the broadest, most philosophical conception of education includes the whole man. The late Mark Hopkins, who for a half century occupied a first place as a Christian educator, spoke with unanswerable force when he said: "If man is to be educated physically and intelligently because he has a physical and intelligent nature, why should he not be educated and trained morally and spiritually because he has a moral and spiritual nature? \* \* If men are to be trained to be strong in muscle, why not strong in the Lord? If to wrestle with each other, why not with wickedness? If to carry on mimic fights and boxing, why not to fight the good fight of faith? If to gain the crown of victory in contests with each other, why not an 'incorruptible crown?' If to run races in the gymnasium and on the campus, why not to run the race that is set before them in which they are 'compassed about with so

great a cloud of witnesses?' Why, in short, if they are to be trained in bodily exercise that 'profiteth little,' should they not be trained in 'godliness that is profitable unto all things?'" When this broad view ceases to be the conception of thoroughness in Midland College, her mission will have ended and her glory will have departed.

This leads me to say in the third and last place, that Midland College comes to commend herself to the sympathy and patronage of this city and of all the States in the West by the *moral and religious principles* on which it is founded.

It will be agreed by all that which distinguishes a Christian College, whilst it should never be narrow nor offensive, should at least be marked. No investigating committee should be required to determine the character of such an institution. There is a demand now, not that sectarian tenets, but that Bible truth and Christian principles be emphasized in education, and it is not without significance that the demand should have been aroused by the tendency to divorce the secular and the religious in education, to which I referred in the beginning. I have intimated that it is the right and duty of the state to educate, but if in exercising this function the state aims to promote the public good, it would seem a contradiction to ignore the moral and the religious in the method. The argument sometimes advanced that for the state to link the religious with the secular in education is at the same time to be sectarian, is fallacious, indeed it is not an argument at all, it is a pretext. I am convinced that there are serious difficulties in the way of the state, in this important matter, and, indeed, it is a question with me whether the state is competent to engage aright in the work of higher education. At the same time, do not the arguments which go to prove the right and duty of the state to provide for the education of the people, go to establish the right and duty of making that education the very best; in other words, both moral and religious?

But however this may be, there can be no kind of question as to the position of the Christian college in this particular. It must be Christian throughout, without pretense or reserve. If Midland College is to have the blessing of Almighty God, if it

is to become great for the Church, this city and State, then the principles upon which it is based, and the spirit, example and purpose which are to characterize its conduct, must be in keeping with the mind and truth of God. This is our avowed testimony in the beginning, and we feel confident that it will commend itself to this community. A school where the young are trained is a most sacred place, and of all places it should be freest from irreligion. The Christian college must have a Christian code, a Christian atmosphere, a Christian example and a Christian aim, and this distinction must never be compromised for any profit or consideration whatever. I am certain I express the profoundest conviction of the Board of Education, and of the faculty, and of the entire Church represented, and I will believe of this audience, when I say that the fondest hopes entertained in behalf of Midland College repose in the fact that God and his word are to be honored in it, and that his kingdom is to be promoted in this city and in this world of the west by it.

Let me state briefly some reasons for this feature of our College, which we emphasize so strongly. I affirm a good reason in the fact that there are colleges, especially in the west, which take care to ignore this feature. They claim the right to educate, but not in the whole range of the faculties. They contend that the foundation of manhood may be left to others, or disregarded; and that it is enough for them to look after the ornamental top. So, some men show wisdom in building a house, but the utmost folly in their methods of building men. Such an influence can only be counteracted by taking higher ground, and offering equal and greater advantages. This is not only demanded by all the sacred interests of home and Church, but by the state. Religion is not only the hope for the soul, but it is the only safe-guard for the great social and political interests of the commonwealth. Sound morality and wholesome culture sustain an intimate relation to national thirst. No man without hoodwinking his conscience and reproaching his reason can scorn this truth of God—"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Christianity is the greatest civilizing, moulding, uplifting power on the globe; it is more

than a set of dogmas, it is a life, a perfect character revealed in Jesus Christ, who is the head of the race and the peerless teacher. It is not the secular, but the Christian college which comes to witness for Him, and to lift His palms in blessing upon the nation's life.

Again the Christian college comes to supplement the functions of family and Church. Who will question that the family and the Church should be Christian? The first institution moulded by the touch of God, not excepting the Church, was the home. There is no more sacred place, no spot on earth that engirds such possibilities as the hearth-stone. Of all places on earth it should be, may be nearest heaven, resonant with its music, radiant with its light. The very reasons that emphasize the need of the moral and religious in the home and in the Church emphasize their need in the college. Midland College is to have all needed facilities by and by; let the first book lifted to the shelves of its library, the book most of all revered, be the Holy Bible, and we are ready to predict that every youth that goes out with its sanctifying touch, will go out to bless the world.

But the college should be Christian in order to improve the quality of our science and culture. These are great forces for weal or for woe. Clutched by immorality and infidelity they are stolen weapons, used often with skill, and always to the serious hurt of the unwary. Christianity owes much to both science and culture; science and culture owe much to Christianity. There are evil tendencies prevalent to-day, the natural outgrowth of science and culture where pursued for unworthy ends, and regardless of religion and the higher needs of man. It is the lofty privilege of the Christian college to overcome these evil tendencies and to bring science and religion together in becoming and helpful fellowship. The Christian college, its over-arching dome filled with heaven's own light, is the temple of both.

Of course, while Midland College, as the representative of the Lutheran Church of the General Synod, will hold to distinctive views, it will be Christian without being sectarian. This College will not assume to control the consciences, nor to determine the ecclesiastical relation of its students; it will stand stoutly, not indeed for that liberalism which regards any or no Christian be-

lief as a matter of indifference, but for that Protestant liberty which is man's high right, and God's own gift. We distinguish between a theological seminary where the dogmas of a particular denomination are taught, and a Christian college offering advantages of a liberal education to all. Christianity will be taught in Midland as bearing upon character and life without being sectarian. This can be done, and I say with conviction, it should be done. I cannot better close this part of my address, upon which I have barely touched, than by a quotation found in a religious journal, from Dr. Porter's last Baccalaureate before the graduating class of Yale College. No one, I am sure, will venture to charge this learned and godly man with fanaticism or lack of experience when he says, speaking of religion in the College: "That it should be wisely Christian need not be suggested; that it should not undo by overdoing is self-evident; but that Christian aims should animate and control its life, is equally manifest. We confess that we cannot understand the logic nor the practical wisdom of those who admit the propriety and necessity of positive Christian influences in the home and seminary, but would omit or exclude them from the college. The reason which they give is that the pupil is no longer a child, and therefore, should be treated as a man. It is true that he is no longer a child, and, perhaps, not a youth; but neither in character nor in convictions has he become a man. Moreover, just at this period of life he is doomed to pass through that fermenting and transition period in which he must form for himself his practical convictions and his theoretical judgments in the light of independent thought. It may be that less can be done in a formal way for either at this time than at any other. It may be, and doubtless is true that officious and ill-timed intermeddling will do more harm than good; and yet, for all that, there is no time or condition of life in which wise Christian influences are more needed, or are more effective than when the spontaneous impulses of childhood and youth are confirmed or rejected by distinct acts of intelligent volition—the judgments of the growing man." Brave, noble words are these, the words of a master, fit to be inwoven with the ground principles of every Christian college in the land. On these grounds, my friends,

we come to claim your sympathy, your patronage, and your prayers. With these principles and these aims we come to give impulse to all that is good and beautiful in your midst, to reward the interest and generosity you have manifested, and to furnish you just cause for gratitude and commendable pride in the time to come.

Joined in heart and hand let us count that we have done well in laying a foundation so broad and stable for Midland College, and that the heavens are already opened in blessing upon our work, because we seek to associate "Jerusalem with Athens; to intertwine the ivy of Parnassus around the cedar of Lebanon; and to weave with the wreath of flowerets plucked from the vale of Tempe, the rose of Sharon;" that we may now, and hereafter in our visits to and festivals on yonder hill, "remember, that among the hills of Palestine there is a hill of tenderer interest and higher hope than either Ida or Olympus." Thus we return to the point from which we started, and lift again the crown to His head, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

**BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.**—*Sermons*, by Jas. R. Woodford, D. D., vol. I. on subjects from the New Testament, vol. II. on subjects from the Old Testament. *Sermons*, preached to the Harrow Boys in the year 1885 and 1886, by the Rev. J. E. C. Wolldon, M. A. *Christianity, Islam, and the Negro Race*, by Edward W. Blydon, LL. D. *The Psalms in History and Biography*, by Rev. John Kerr, D. D. *A South Window*, or Keep Yourselves in the Love of God, by George F. Pentecost, D. D. *Social Aspects of Christianity*, by Brook Foss Westcott, D. D., D. C. L. *The People's Bible*, Discourses on the Holy Scripture, by Joseph Parker, D. D. *Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. *Atonement*, Review of "Atonement and Law" by S. G. Burney, D. D., LL. D. *Is there any Salvation after Death?* by E. D. Morris, D. D., LL. D.

**SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.**—*Sociology*, by John Bascom, LL. D. *Elements of Physiological Psychology*, by George T. Ladd. *History of*

*Modern Philosophy, by Kuno Fischer, Descartes and His School*, Translated by J. P. Gordy, Ph. D., Edited by Noah Parker, D. D., LL. D. *Of the Doctrine of Morality in its Relation to the Grace of Redemption*, by Robert B. Fairbairn, D. D., LL. D. *System of Christian Ethics*, by Dr. J. H. Dorner, Translated by Prof. C. M. Means, D. D. *The Science of Thought*, by Max Müller. *Philosophy of Theism*, by Borden P. Bowne.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Ancient History*, from the Dispersion of the Sons of Noe to the Battle of Actium and the Change of the Roman Republic into an Empire, by Peter Fredet, D. D. *The Story of the Life of Queen Victoria*, by W. W. Tulloch, B. D. *Martin Luther, His Life and Works*, by Peter Bayne, LL. D., in two volumes. *A History of the Baptists*, by Thomas Armitage, D. D., LL. D. *Life of Leo XIII. from an Authentic Memoir*, by Bernard O'Reilly, D. D., LL. D. *Reminiscences of James A. Garfield*, by Carydon E. Fuller. *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, His Life, His Works, and His Friendships*, by George Lowell Austin.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Woman, First and Last, and What She has Done*, by Mrs. E. J. Richword. *Methods of Church Work*, by the Rev. S. Stall, A. M. *The Pleasures of Life*, by Sir John Lubbock. *The Christ in Life*, by J. L. Batchelder. *The Gospel in Nature*, by Henry C. McCook, D. D. *Beecher as a Humorist*, Selections from Published Works of Henry Ward Beecher, Compiled by Eleanore Kirk.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

*Scenes in Southern India*. By Mrs. Murray Mitchell. With numerous Illustrations. pp. 372.

No one can read without a pleasurable interest these sprightly pages of one who describes with the freshness of an eye-witness the scenes of an extended missionary journey, who speaks with all the sympathy of a woman's heart and with the intelligence afforded by a long experience among the India missions. Those who believe in Foreign Missions, who labor and make sacrifices for this cause, will here have a confirmation of their faith and an ample compensation for their efforts, while those who are skeptical on this subject will find their doubts melting away, as the ice yields to the warm sunlight of spring. The transformation which is being effected by the Gospel in India is simply marvelous. The story of it as related here seems more wonderful than the golden dreams of fancy. Yet its truth no one denies. Books of this character

ought to go into all the Sunday School libraries. And blessed is the family that relishes and appreciates such literature.

*Universal Beliefs; or the Great Consensus.* By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., Author of "Ecce Coelum" etc. pp. 312.

With all the diversity of religious beliefs there are certain cardinal convictions which are common to all religions and which in a measure "make the whole world kin." Among these fundamental truths which have been universally embraced are those of the existence of Superhuman Beings, a Supreme Deity, earthly Providence, Religious Worship, Efficacious Prayer, Infallible Oracles, Immortality, etc. This does not cover the whole scope of the gospel, but one cannot read this volume without recognizing the universal soil which has been prepared for the Gospel, which is after all, the one religion called for and in a measure foreshadowed by the great and indestructible truths in which all nations and all ages have believed. To fight against Christianity is in effect to make war upon the common faith of mankind. The reading of such a work is well calculated to promote firmness of religious conviction, and it were well if a wide circulation among skeptical minds could be secured for it.

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

*The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century.* By John Henry Overton, Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Epworth. pp. 208.

The subject of this monograph is a movement whose incipiency really antedated the societies founded by Wesley, while its compass extended far beyond the Methodist organization and its results are still visible in both England and America. In the judgment of the author, who has made a careful study of this era and who writes with the spirit of fairness and candor, the glory of "originating the Evangelical Revival" belongs to William Law, a high-churchman, who had indeed "no sympathy with the course which the fire took," after having thrown the spark that kindled it. The influence of the Moravians is acknowledged. "The religious societies supplied a body to Methodism, the Moravians a soul." But it is surprising to find no recognition of the impulse which came from German Pietism in the Lutheran Church.

A clear distinction is drawn between the Methodists and the Evangelicals, the latter confining their ministrations within parochial limits, the former preferring the system of itinerancy and practicing various irregularities. "All Methodists would have wished to be called Evangelical, and all Evangelicals, whether they wished it or no, were called Methodists."

The chapter on the "Literature of the Revival" will have peculiar interest to many. Wilberforce's "Practical View," Hannah More's works and some others were stamped with such intrinsic merit that they furnish to-day a good example of the 'survival of the fittest,' but

even the sermons of John Wesley "as specimens of pulpit oratory cannot for a moment be compared with those of our great classical preachers, such as Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, or South." "As to George Whitfield's sermons, it is unfortunate for his reputation as a preacher that any specimens should have been preserved." The specific merit of the preaching of these immortal divines consisted evidently in their adaptation to the distinct end of preaching. The thoughtful will derive not only historical knowledge but a great deal of real profit from the reading of this little work, which is written in a clear and strong style.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*Introduction to Psychological Theory.* By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, Author of "Metaphysics." pp. 329. 1887.

Prof. Bowne stands in the first rank of American writers on psychology and metaphysics. He is there by the merit of what has come from his pen. Uniting a healthy conservatism with true independence of thought his discussions represent to an unusual degree the line of genuine progress in the department of psychological inquiry.

The work before us sustains the author's well-earned reputation. It is not offered as a systematic psychology. It essays no regular classification of the mental faculties. But it discusses the principles of the science and aims, by an analysis of the psychical facts, to discover and present the true psychology of the different powers. The work is therefore, as its name imports, truly introductory to the elaboration of a psychological theory, settling the various troublesome questions which the student of the science is obliged to meet. The conception and the execution are marked by unusual originality. The author's plan did not require him to deal much with the physiological conditions or attendants of mental action. It is gratifying to see that he does not concede the exaggerated importance claimed for these by the "new psychology" in the settlement of the facts or the principles of psychology. He well says: "The study of the physical conditions of our mental life has a pathological and practical importance; but it does not promise any valuable psychological results, at least for those who can distinguish between the physical conditions and the mental facts which they condition." Nor does the plan include the *metaphysics* of the science. The problems which this would raise are beyond and subsequent to the ground-work here sought in the actual basal facts. The whole work is divided into two parts: The Factors of the Mental Life, and The Factors in Combination. Under these the discussion runs through The Subject of the Mental Life, Sensation, The Mechanism of Reproduction, Cerebral Theory of Reproduction, The Thought Factor, The Feelings, Will and Action, Consciousness and Self-consciousness, Perception, The

Forms of Reproduction, The Thought Process, Interaction of Soul and Body, Sleep and Abnormal Mental Phenomena.

These topics, it will be readily seen, require the author to discuss almost all the questions of psychical fact and principle which enter into the determination of psychological theory. The discussion everywhere exhibits the author's familiarity with the history of the science, the fulness of his resources, the clearness of his insight, the soundness of his judgment and mastery of the materials. The chapter on the subject of the mental life is a fine example of acute, clear and vigorous analysis and argument. As a brief refutation of the claims of materialism or the view which leaves the mental states without a mental subject, we know of nothing equal to it. By an equally clear array of evidence, the chapter on the process of reproduction is made an annihilating exhibit of the inadequacy and absurdity of the sensational and associational theories of memory. The cerebral theory receives a special examination and its "grotesque whimsies" pass under a most trenchant exposure. The examination into the nature and action of the thought factor is a clear and strong showing of the utter fallacy of the explanation of empiricism, and full evidence of the origin of the *a priori* ideas of Time, Space, Cause, Substance and Attribute, etc., from the direct and necessary activity of the mental subject or rational self. Some features of the discussion of this topic, however, are less satisfactory. The author's positive explanation seems in some respects to be indefinite and ambiguous, if not misleading, particularly as to the real genesis and the validity of these ideas in their primary character. Though he allows that these stand for objective reality, some of his ways of representing them are not adapted to assure the veracity of the mental principle which establishes them. He speaks of them as "products" of the mind, "contributions" of the mind. The mind is represented as compelled "to give its objects spatial forms and relations, rather than that it views its objects under the form of space because they are in space. All this will seem to many to be an unnecessary concession to the Kantian subjectivity, and a needless introduction of a rupture between being and knowing. It may, indeed, be said that this point is to be settled not by psychology, but by metaphysics. But there does not appear to be any need that psychology, even under guidance of the author's own order of thinking and explanation, should intrude the suggestion conveyed by this mode of statement. The rational principle may be more justly and consistently represented as intuitively perceptive of what *is* than as possibly creative of what may only seem to be.

An appendix is added to the chapter on this subject to show the relation of the doctrine of evolution to the explanation of the thought-categories. The sensational and associational psychology has taken great comfort and tried to get aid from this doctrine. But the searching analytic of our author lays bare the fact that the vaunted hypothesis of

evolution while, on the one hand it surrenders the argument of sensationalism on its old ground, on the other furnishes no solution out of its own resources.

But we need not extend this notice. Waiving all points of criticism, Prof. Bowne has here given a work of great ability and rare value. It is one of the books which give and mark progress in true science. Though called an 'introduction' it is, however, not a book for beginners. Its discussions can be rightly appreciated only by such as are to some degree acquainted with the problems of psychology. But to advanced students and instructors in this department, it will be found exceedingly rich and profitable.

M. V.

*The Russian Church and Russian Dissent.* Comprising Orthodoxy, Dissent, and Erratic Sects. By Alfred F. Heard, formerly Consul-General for Russia at Shanghai. pp. 310. 1887.

Mr. Heard has traced in this volume the development of Christianity in Russia from its prehistoric traditions to the various sects, and the stirring religious movements which characterize the Muscovite empire of to-day. The great doctrinal and ecclesiastical problems of the past, and those of the present, along with their relation to the national life, are brought under review in a way to engage the reader's attention and to enrich his stock of knowledge. In the course of reading these pages one also gets some insight into that strange paradox that a people whose "strongest and most general characteristic is religious devotion," should be exceedingly slow to emerge from the state of barbarism. With a nation to whom "form and ceremony alone constitute religion," the force of divine truth can in the nature of things make but feeble progress.

It is a disappointment to find this volume restricted to the Established Russian Church and the dissenting sects which have sprung from its bosom. The most notable religious feature of Russia, at the present time, is the heartless and wicked persecution which the 4,000,000 Lutherans in Finland and the Baltic provinces are suffering from the Imperial government. But it does not appear to have fallen within the purview of the work to notice either the Lutheran, Roman Catholic, or Jewish communions, which constitute so large a portion of the Tsar's subjects. But for this defect, which is not a slight one, it must be recognized as a fair compendium of the diversified and seething elements which are working out the destiny of the Slavic race. It is intended for the general reader rather than for the specialist, but the philosophic mind will be struck with its suggestiveness on ecclesiastical subjects in general. It is written in a lucid, lively and sympathetic style, compact in form, marked by a judicious, unpartisan temper, and bearing throughout the stamp of a real contribution to literature, as certain of popularity as it is of permanent value.

VOL. XVII. No. 4.

77

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

For Sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

*The Appeal to Life.* By Theodore T. Munger, Author of "Freedom of Faith," pp. 339. 1887.

Mr. Munger is among the foremost religious writers of the day, a sincere, thoughtful, earnest exponent of living truths, throwing over old themes the charm of freshness, stimulating the reader to further inquiry and awakening in him somewhat of the independence of judgment which distinguishes the author.

The "Appeal to Life" means an attempt to present the truth "set in the light of daily life and the real processes of human society," in other words to subject religious thought to the inductive method. The themes of the discourses are such as "The Witness from Experience," "Christ's Treatment of Unwilling Skeptics," "Truth through and by Life," "Trust and Righteousness," "The Twofold Force in Salvation," "Faith Essential Righteousness," "Evolution and the Faith," &c., &c.

We are glad to see the vital truths here discussed go forth in a form so striking, sprightly and beautiful as to secure extensive reading, but we heartily regret that misinterpretations of both scripture and life also seriously impair the soundness and value of this volume.

Take for instance, the treatment of faith as essential righteousness. That faith is the source of righteousness, that it involves "a moral quality and force that ensure righteousness" is a most important truth, but to teach that God accepts you because you do so trust him as to show that you have a moral quality, to teach that faith is counted for righteousness because it reveals a real righteousness, is equivalent to denying that the sinner is saved purely and solely through the mercy of God. Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners. He himself testified that he did not come to save the righteous, yet here we are taught that because of the essential righteousness which inheres in faith "God counts one worthy." This is not the way of salvation revealed by Paul and expounded by Luther. The appeal of the Publican was directed to the mercy of God, the moral quality present in his faith did not come into consideration, yet he was justified. God saved him, a sinner, because he is merciful, and not because the wretched man had first attained to an inherent moral quality in his faith.

It may be added here, too, that these champions of a new theology would improve our opinion of their theological simplicity and single-eyed devotion to truth, if they would somewhat check their propensity to exaggerate the conflicts and errors which marked theological parties in the past. Those opposing schools may have turned passages from Paul to a use he never dreamed of, crowded them with meaning that he did not intend, and made them the rallying cry of theological champions, and a very body of divinity. But we are still waiting to see evidences of a different disposition among the "new" theologians. So far as the

reviewer's reading extends, they have about as much party spirit and prejudice, about as much human infirmity and inclination to read their own preconceptions into the Scriptures, as there ever was among the much-abused Arminians and Calvinists.

*The Exeter Lectures.* Lectures delivered before the Students of Phillips Exeter Academy, 1885-86. By Presidents McCosh, Walker, Bartlett, Robinson, Porter, and Carter, and Rev. Drs. Hale and Brooks. pp. 208. 1887.

The Trustees of the Exeter School were right when they judged that these lectures were adapted to a wider service than that accomplished in their delivery. Dr. Hale speaks of Physical, Mental, and Spiritual Exercises; Dr. McCosh, of Habit and its Influence in the Training at School; Dr. Walker, of Socialism; Dr. Bartlett, of The Spontaneous Element in Scholarship; Dr. Carter, of The Sentiment of Reverence; Dr. Robinson, of Men, Made, Self-made, and Unmade; Dr. Porter, of The Ideal Scholar; and Dr. Brooks, of Biography. These lectures are replete with important truth and counsels, adapted to the young, and put in form to interest and influence them. The scholarly lecturers knew how to throw vivacity and sunshine through the addresses. The book ought to go into the library of all schools and academies and colleges and be read by the young.

M. V.

*The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Robert Browning.* In six volumes. Crown 8vo.

Vol. V.: *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country*, Aristophanes' Apology, The Inn Album, Pacchiarotto, and How He Worked in Distemper and Other Poems.

Vol. VI.: *The Agamemnon of Æschylus La Saisiaz*, The Two Poets of Croisic, Dramatic Idylls, Jocoseria, Ferishta's Fancies and Parleyings. With an Index of First Lines and General Index of Titles.

These two volumes complete this superb "Riverside Edition" of Browning, noticed in our last issue, an edition which being an exact reprint of the poet's latest revision greatly surpasses previous American issues, and which is sure to be added to every good library.

Browning may not have as wide a popularity as some of our own sweet singers, like Longfellow and Whittier, but the scope and dignity of his conceptions, his vigor of thought, his love of liberty, his dramatic power, his rugged humor and tender pathos, his Christian theism and refined morality command for him one of the foremost positions in the alcoves of modern literature, and insure him an abiding fame.

Each volume can be purchased singly, being so bound as to be complete in itself. Few, however, who will look upon the charming set with their own eyes will resist the temptation to purchase the whole edition. And proud will be the student whose purse can compass such a possession.

*The Gates Between.* By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. pp. 222. 1887.

Miss Phelps is no mean theologian, though never making much pretense to orthodoxy. Like her "Gates Ajar" and "Beyond the Gates," the present little work will hardly improve her reputation in this line. She does by no means confine herself to what is written, and in her imagination of the Hereafter seems to have no fear of the anathema with which the volume of revelation closes. This latest product of her pen accords with the eschatology of the so-called "New Theology," and as a work of fiction is a fitting illustration of that fictitious annex to the truth once delivered to the saints. It is, however, to thoughtful readers a very entertaining tale, marked by that bold fancy, exalted range of sentiment, exquisite language and suggestive power which distinguish all the works of this brilliant authoress.

JOHN B. ALDEN, NEW YORK.

*The Life of Jesus according to Extra-Canonical Sources.* By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D. pp. 189. 1887.

This is the first attempt to combine from the apocryphal gospels a connected and continues account in English of the life of Christ. There are about fifty such gospels, besides a great number of other spurious apocryphal writings, of no historical authority, and denied by the Church any place in the list of canonical books. Dr. Pick has prepared this work after the plan and arrangement of Rudolph Hofmann's *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*. Thirteen pages of notes follow the body of the book, containing references to the writings from which the narrative is compiled, and such other literary matter as may be interesting to students. The work has been done with care and discrimination, and will prove of much interest to those who desire to form a connected view of the representation which these spurious writings present of the life of Jesus.

M. V.

*Historical Sketch of the Jews, since the Destruction of Jerusalem.* By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D. pp. 46. 1887.

This small volumes gives us an excellent outline view of the fortunes of this dispersed and wonderful people. It will be helpful to the student who wishes to get a clear and related view of the summit points in their history, into just connection with which his after reading may unite and associate the abundant facts and details of fuller historical works.

M. V.

